

indeed time we dealt with this problem with both an open heart and an open mind.

The editorial follows:

THE IMMUNE SOCIETY

There are three Americas today.

There is the America whose sons are fighting in Vietnam, and that America knows full well the agony and anxiety of the struggle.

There is the America that is locked in the ghettos by white racism and white indifference, and that America knows the agony of life as a second-class community.

Then there is the comfortable America, the immune America, the white-collar and well-off America, for whom life is business (and pleasure) as usual. And that, regrettably, is the America that dominates national thinking. It is an America that seems untouched by all the sorrow and misery of a divided, distracted nation.

Conspicuous consumption is the keynote of this third America. The governors of the several states meet in Washington, dining on the finest food and sipping the finest wines. The wives of those governors are invited to the White House for a sumptuous luncheon and a show of the latest, lavish fashions for women. Only a few blocks away from the White House are some of the festering Negro slums of Washington. Only seconds away, by

TV beamed from satellites, are more than 500,000 young Americans who are ready to offer their lives to maintain the independence of South Vietnam and to prevent its domination by Communism.

Can a society so generally unmoved by compassion survive? That is the real question. A TV report on Vietnam the other night focused, for a few seconds, on a young soldier blacking his face as he prepared to go out beyond the barbed wire at Khe Sanh on patrol. "Are you frightened?" asked the commentator interviewing him. "Sure," he said, "we're all frightened, but we have to do our duty." A few moments later, that moving episode was followed by a commercial for an antacid that relieves stomach distress caused by over-eating.

There is another example. An advertisement shows two women outside a library in a pleasant Westchester village. In the foreground is a new Rolls-Royce. The caption: "The new Rolls-Royce Silver Shadow turns a trip to the library (or to the hairdresser's or the supermarket or the post office) into a sinfully luxurious experience . . . Cost \$20,600."

What we are experiencing is a true, not a manufactured, credibility gap—a gap in our own credibility. We send our men to Vietnam to fight, but most of us at home remain unaffected by their sacrifice. We talk

about programs to mitigate the problem of the ghettos, but the President's Commission on Civil Disorders points out that too many members of the white majority are secretly pleased to lock up the Negroes in their own communities.

Of course, most in the U.S. have never truly faced up to the fact that we are fighting a two-front war. By waiting too long to raise taxes, the administration has sought to make this an era of no sacrifice. The war in Vietnam, to all too many people, is merely an unpleasant offstage echo—nasty, but something to let the other fellow worry about.

This state of pietistic indifference cannot and must not go on. We face challenges in the slums that will absorb a staggering amount of the national income. We face increasing costs in Vietnam, and yet our congressional leaders dawdle over a proposed surcharge on income taxes. We are going to have to make some agonizing choices, and soon.

The three Americas cannot exist side by side. Unless we make this one America, once more, the conflicts dimly looming in the future may become the cataclysms of tomorrow. The immune America—the unseeing, unfeeling America—must become the first casualty of the realism and sacrifice these grim times demand.

SENATE—Thursday, March 7, 1968

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF).

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, who art the hope of all the ends of the earth.

Thou who committest to us the swift and solemn trust of life, teach us to number our days, that we may apply our hearts unto wisdom. Consecrate with Thy presence the way our feet may go, and the humblest work will shine.

As Thy servants in this temple of democracy, give us courage and strength for the vast task of social rebuilding that needs to be dared if life for all men is to be made full and free.

In and through the change and confusion of these bewildering times, we are made confident by the divine promise, "As Thy day, so shall Thy strength be."

Thou hast made us to be Thy temples. Grant that the sacred places of our inner lives may harbor nothing unworthy of our high calling in Thee:

"The ruins of our soul repair,
And make our heart a house of prayer."

In the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, March 6, 1968, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and I

suggest that the attachés of the Senate inform Senators that this may be a live quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

	[No. 36 Leg.]	
Byrd, W. Va.	Holland	Miller
Cannon	Javits	Mondale
Cooper	Kuchel	Talmadge
Ervin	Lausche	Thurmond
Gore	Mansfield	
Hart	Metcalfe	

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] are necessarily absent.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is absent by leave of the Senate because of death in his family.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CANNON in the chair). A quorum is not present.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to order the presence of absent Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, the following Senators entered the Chamber and answered to their names:

Aiken	Bartlett	Boggs
Allott	Bayh	Brewster
Anderson	Bennett	Brooke
Baker	Bible	Burdick

Byrd, Va.	Hollings	Pell
Carlson	Hruska	Percy
Case	Inouye	Prouty
Church	Jackson	Proxmire
Clark	Jordan, N.C.	Randolph
Cotton	Jordan, Idaho	Ribicoff
Curtis	Kennedy, Mass.	Russell
Dodd	Kennedy, N.Y.	Scott
Dominick	Long, Mo.	Smathers
Eastland	Long, La.	Smith
Ellender	Magnuson	Sparkman
Fannin	McClellan	Spong
Fong	McGee	Stennis
Fulbright	McGovern	Symington
Griffin	McIntyre	Tower
Gruening	Monroney	Tydings
Hansen	Montoya	Williams, N.J.
Harris	Morse	Williams, Del.
Hartke	Moss	Yarborough
Hatfield	Mundt	Young, N. Dak.
Hayden	Murphy	Young, Ohio
Hickenlooper	Nelson	
Hill	Pearson	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

INTERFERENCE WITH CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The BILL CLERK. A bill (H.R. 2516) to prescribe penalties for certain acts of violence or intimidation, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

APPROVAL OF LONG-TERM CONTRACTS FOR DELIVERY OF WATER FROM NAVAJO RESERVOIR, N. MEX.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House of

Representatives on Senate Joint Resolution 123.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 123) to approve

long-term contracts for delivery of water from Navajo Reservoir in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes, which was, on page 2, after the fifth line from the top, strike out:

	Water diversion (acre-feet)	Estimated water depletion (acre-feet)	Proposed uses
Public Service Co. of New Mexico.....	20, 200	16, 200	Thermal-electric generation.
Southern Union Gas Co.....	50	50	Pump cooling.
	20, 250	16, 250	

And insert:

	Water diversion (acre-feet)	Estimated water depletion (acre-feet)	Proposed uses
Public Service Co. of New Mexico.....	20, 200	16, 200	Thermal-electric generation.
Southern Union Gas Co.....	50	50	Pump cooling.
Utah Construction and Mining Co.....	44, 000	35, 300	Thermal-electric generation.
	64, 250	51, 550	

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the House has added an amendment to this joint resolution which would include a contract for the sale of water to the Utah Construction & Mining Co. from the Navajo Reservoir. At the time the Senate considered the legislation there were only two contracts before us which had been submitted by the Secretary of the Interior. Before the House acted, the third contract was submitted to Congress and it has been included. The State of New Mexico supports this contract and therefore, Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Mexico.

The motion was agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself 30 seconds, and ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

S. 3110, S. 3111, AND S. 3112—INTRODUCTION OF BILLS TO AID MINORITY VIETNAM VETERANS, MAKE VA HOUSING, TRAINING, AND COUNSELING BENEFITS AVAILABLE IN CENTRAL CITY SLUM AREAS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on January 30, the President of the United States laid before both Houses of Congress a special message on veterans' benefits. In the course of that message, the President referred to Abraham Lincoln's invocation to the Nation "to care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and orphan."

I agree with the President's message, and it should be emphasized that these returning veterans represent, not only an obligation placed upon American society, but also a challenge and an opportunity presented to it.

In that context, I believe that the package of GI benefits, even if amended as proposed by the President's message, is not complete. Increasing the maximum

guarantee on GI home loans—indeed, even the existence of home loan guarantees—means little to those veterans who are unable to find adequate housing; skill-training in the Armed Forces means little to those veterans who are unable to find employment in skilled, clerical, and managerial positions.

The GI bill of rights—and its subsequent extensions—has had an enormous impact on American society. It has permitted tens of thousands of Americans—who might never have had the opportunity—to acquire education and training, and to purchase homes. It has thus given them the tools of social mobility. The enormously wide dispersion of affluence in this Nation, the great increase in the number and percentage of the college educated, the explosion of the suburbs—all of these revolutions which have characterized American society since the Second World War, have been accelerated—in some cases, caused—by the broad extension of GI benefits. Thus, the Second World War and the Korean conflict represent, not only events of historical significance but also domestic social watersheds.

Despite all the tragedy and dissension which have characterized our involvement in Vietnam, let us not forget that it, too, will inevitably represent a watershed in the social history of this Nation.

For almost 3 years, this country has had large numbers of combat troops committed to the war in Vietnam. The growing intensity of the war—as well as of the domestic debate over our involvement—must not cause us to lose sight of the burdens borne by the individual combat soldiers. These men are now returning to civilian life in increasing numbers. Their sacrifices cannot be ignored once they have put aside their uniforms and their weapons.

No matter what the purposes of our involvement, no matter the ideals that may motivate our efforts, for many of these soldiers military service in Vietnam has afforded them their first opportunity to contribute to a national effort on a basis of equality and full human worth. It is an indictment of our society that such opportunity could occur only in uniform, only in the context of armed conflict.

Nonetheless, this has occurred. Surely these men will seek—and rightfully expect—full participation in all aspects of American society and an equal opportunity to share in its rewards. No man who has, quite literally, put his life "on-the-line" for his country should face limited opportunity or discrimination in the pursuit of job, education or shelter. As the Vice President of the United States has said:

You can't ask a fellow American to fight and die in Vietnam and then relegate him to second class citizenship when he comes home.

In the last few years we have taken tremendous steps forward in guaranteeing such equality—in voting, in employment and, most importantly, in the measure that is before this body at this very moment, in housing. However, much remains to be done, in particular, we must round out the program of veterans' benefits, we must structure veterans' programs so that they are relevant to the realities—to the obstacles and opportunities—present in American society today and which these returning veterans must face.

Accordingly, I introduce for appropriate reference three bills to amend the veterans law and to extend GI benefits.

The first of these bills would amend the home loan provisions of the veterans law. It would expand the program of direct VA loans for the purchase or construction of homes so as to include veterans living in the ghettos of our cities. Many of our veterans, not yet able to purchase homes in a totally free market, are forced to live in depressed urban areas. Often they cannot obtain mortgages through normal private channels. Such veterans cannot take full advantage of the home loan guaranty program. Indicative of this need, in October 1967 the Bureau of Labor Statistics reported that a much lower percent of nonwhite veterans had obtained GI home loans. According to figures supplied by the Veterans' Administration, as of late 1962 and early 1963, 14 percent of nonwhite Second World War and Korean war veterans had obtained GI home loans and another 12 percent of the nonwhite veterans had tried but failed to obtain such loans. The comparable figures for white veterans were 34 and 7 percent.

For these veterans, increasing the maximum guarantee on veterans home loans, as requested by the President, in and of itself, is not the answer. Under present law, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, if he finds that the veteran is living in a rural area, or in a small city or town in which mortgages are not readily available, may designate such an area as a "housing credit shortage area." In these areas, the VA may extend direct home loans and is not limited to guaranteeing mortgages. This provision was inserted in the law, when, following the Second World War, we discovered that many veterans could not obtain normal mortgages. At that time, as a Representative, I was active in the effort to expand the law in this manner. We face a similar situation today, but it is found in the depressed areas of our cities. Many of our current veterans are returning to urban

areas in which mortgages are similarly unavailable. I believe that the Federal Government should assume the credit risk in this situation, for the social benefit far outweighs the economic cost. Accordingly, the bill I introduce today would amend section 1811 of title 38 to include a "depressed urban area" as a possible area in which direct home loans might be extended.

There also must be substantial improvement and expansion of VA counseling services. The Veterans' Administration is the one agency which must make at least one contact with a veteran after he has returned to civilian life. We must fully capitalize on this opportunity by broadening the scope of this counseling and providing for it in such locations and on such a basis to make it truly available to those who most need it. About 750,000 men are discharged from the military services each year. All are contacted; all can be counseled by the Veterans' Administration.

Second, I introduce today a bill to give the Veterans' Administration new authority to provide counseling and technical assistance to veterans with regard to business and home loans. This would include advising veterans as to available housing, and advising and assisting them to utilize fully housing rights and benefits available to them under all laws. The technical assistance to veterans would seek to promote and train veterans as owners and managers of businesses. To make this assistance meaningful this bill would extend the business loan program to cold war and Vietnam veterans.

Counseling services can and must be brought to the areas of greatest need. The VA's offices—and particularly the new "one stop" centers—should be located in the depressed areas of our core cities. It is interesting to note that the new one-stop center in New York City is located in downtown Manhattan. Compare the availability of this service to our deprived citizens to the readiness with which he can obtain information about joining the Armed Forces: there are two Armed Forces recruiting centers in Harlem, one in the East New York section of Brooklyn and two in the South Bronx—all are areas affected by poverty. If we make this effort to induce residents of our ghettos to enlist in the military service, certainly we can make the same effort to reach them once they have returned to civilian life. Moreover, the hours of VA centers should be suited to the needs of the recipients of the counseling services—they should be long and flexible—and the counseling services should be brought to the veterans—into their neighborhoods.

Finally, we must take action to guarantee useful employment for our returning veterans—employment which will permit them to use their skills and leadership, and to advance. As President Johnson noted, most veterans will go into the private sector. The Senate is soon to consider a resolution which would express the sense of the Congress that private employers give job priority to returning servicemen. I support this resolution—but clearly we must do far more than express our sentiment.

In his message to the Congress, the President expressed his concern that some returning veterans had such difficulty finding jobs that they had to rely on unemployment compensation. Throughout the Nation 174,932 recent discharges—roughly speaking, men who had served in the Armed Forces within the prior year—filed for unemployment compensation and drew those benefits for an average total of 10.7 weeks during fiscal year 1966. In New York State alone, over 9,000 veterans filed for unemployment during the comparable period and were unemployed for 9.2 weeks. The national figures for fiscal year 1967 are 161,878 veterans who drew unemployment compensation for an average total of 9.3 weeks. These statistics hardly present a reassuring picture of material security and economic opportunity for the many men who have served in the service of their Nation during a critical period.

Third, to afford our veterans the fullest opportunity possible to obtain job training, I also introduce a bill which would permit a veteran to use his educational assistance for courses which have been in existence for less than 2 years, provided the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs specifically waives the requirement. The purpose of this change is to grant the Administrator flexibility. In the next few years we will, hopefully, witness many new training opportunities made available to veterans through the cooperation of Government agencies, private concerns, and labor unions, as for example in the new electronics, automation, or computer techniques. Under present law, such courses are effectively foreclosed to veterans—no matter their value and relevance to his needs—merely because they are new. I am aware of the dangers posed by such a change, but a careful use of the Administrator's discretion will broaden educational and training opportunities for veterans without permitting the use of veterans' benefits for programs without substance. The Administrator should have this flexibility.

It is my intention also to offer these three bills as amendments to the bills dealing with veterans benefits currently being considered by the Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee. I hope that these measures will be considered at the same time.

The young men who are being asked to bear the burdens of the bloody and tragic conflict in Vietnam are acquiring leadership traits and self-assurance which will be invaluable in civilian life. We must guarantee that we have created an open society, a society of opportunity, receptive to the talents, skills, and commitments of our returning combat soldiers. We have far to go in creating such a society. This fact is dramatically reflected in the disparity in reenlistment figures. In October 1967 the Bureau of Labor Statistics reported that 46 percent of nonwhites reenlist after their first term in the Armed Forces, as compared to 18 percent of the whites.

These men are expressing a belief that opportunity and security will be greater for them in uniform than in civilian life. We cannot accept this situation. It

is our obligation to insure that, at least for those men who have been asked to bear the burdens and to pay the horrible price of Vietnam combat, the society for which they have fought and to which they will one day return, is also one of full opportunity.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills, introduced by Mr. JAVITS, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred as indicated:

S. 3110. A bill to amend section 1811 of title 38, United States Code, so as to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to make direct loans for housing under such section in certain urban areas whenever private capital is not available for such purpose; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 3111. A bill to amend chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code, in order to provide counseling and technical assistance to veterans eligible for home and business loans under such chapter, and for other purposes; and

S. 3112. A bill to amend section 1675 of title 38, United States Code, in order to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to waive the requirement that a course of training must have been in operation for 2 years or more by an educational institution before such course may be approved for the enrollment of eligible veterans; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INTERFERENCE WITH CIVIL RIGHTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2516) to prescribe penalties for certain acts of violence or intimidation, and for other purposes.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The pending business is an amendment which I offered to the Dirksen substitute. It is amendment No. 556. It proposes to strike the word "discourage" on page 2, line 21, and substitute "prevent"; and, on page 5, line 5, to strike the word "discourage" and substitute "prevent".

Mr. President, the word "discourage" appears again in the housing section of this bill on page 26, line 15.

I have offered amendment No. 595. I ask unanimous consent to call up amendment No. 595 and ask that the two amendments, No. 556 and No. 595, be considered and acted upon en bloc.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I do not wish to object—we must preserve our rights. Does this mean we shall not have authority to seek a separate vote on each amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the unanimous-consent request is agreed to,

to consider these amendments en bloc, they would be acted on by one vote.

Mr. JAVITS. Then, I ask the Senator momentarily to withhold his request.

Mr. COOPER. Does the Senator object?

Mr. JAVITS. I would much rather the Senator did not put me in that position, if the Senator will hold off momentarily.

Mr. COOPER. Very well, for a time.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I ask the Senator from Kentucky—I have not really studied the amendment, but I gather it is his idea that if we did more preventing, we would be less discouraged; is that correct?

Mr. COOPER. Yes.

Mr. President, I am sorry there are not more Senators present, because this is a rather difficult subject to explain. It may seem technical, but it is not technical; it is substantive and I believe my changes should be adopted.

As I have said, there are three sections of the pending bill in which this word is used. On page 2, line 21 of section (b) (1). I should like to read the language.

It says:

Whoever, whether or not acting under color of law, by force or threat of force willfully injures, intimidates or interferes with, or attempts to injure, intimidate or interfere with,

(1) any person because he is or has been, or in order to discourage such person or any other person or any class of persons from—

This language is followed by a list of the constitutional rights, or rights which have been prescribed by Congress under the interstate commerce clause—rights, the exercise of which the language I have quoted is designed to protect. But in using the word "discourage" the section quoted goes too far.

The language of the section I have quoted, and the language of other sections which are generally similar, lay out the elements of a criminal offense. One is that the person who is trying to prevent the exercise of a constitutional right acts with force or threat of force, or commits some acts which are physical, or are intrusions upon the personality of the complainant.

Section 1 sets out the necessary motive of this person who is charged with a criminal offense in having attempted to prevent the exercise of a constitutional right. That language is:

Any person because he is or has been—

That is to say, he is or has been attempting to exercise his constitutional rights—

or in order to discourage such person or any other person or any class of persons from exercising a constitutional right.

Think of what we are doing if we retain the word "discourage." An individual whose acts "discouraged" a person from exercising a constitutional right—a subjective determination—could then be charged under the criminal sanctions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. COOPER. I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

My first argument for this change is that I do not know of any precedent in

criminal law which would establish as a crime, or element of a crime, the discouragement of another. A criminal action requires that certain acts have a definite consequence, both being ascertainable by proof: the acts of the person and the consequences which result.

In this case, the first element is present: that a person who is charged, with the prevention of the exercise of a right, does an act. But a second element is not present; that is, the consequences of such acts against another person. The individual making the complaint could simply say "I was discouraged from exercising such a right."

It is a subjective result, depending upon what the individual states. He does not say, "I did not exercise the right" and "I was prevented from exercising the right." He might simply say, "I was discouraged from exercising the right."

We know that in criminal law, to convict a person, he must be proved guilty beyond reasonable doubt. Here, we would make an element of a criminal action the subjective attitude of a person claiming to be offended—that he is discouraged from undertaking an act.

My word "prevent," I submit, is proper, because if persons act with force or threat of force against others because they are seeking to exercise constitutional rights, it is evidently only because they seek to prevent—I repeat prevent—such exercise of a constitutional right. But I would argue that if a person can be convicted upon the proof of an individual saying, "Well, I was discouraged somewhat; I did not feel I should go ahead and exercise my right," then the language of the bill goes too far.

There is no precedent in law and logic for using the word "discourage," and I hope very much my amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. President, again may I plead for the attention of the Senate, because this is not a simple problem.

First, let me say I had the greatest sympathy with Senator Cooper when I read his amendment. On investigation it appears, however, that it will not accomplish the purposes of this law, if we pass it, or meet the situation factually in the field. If you prevent A from doing something that he has a right to do, that is a crime; but in this particular field if you intimidate or use force on B, that also can, though it would not be operative in law, discourage or change the disposition of A to assert his rights.

That is exactly what has happened. Suppose the Ku Klux Klan beats another Negro, or kills another Negro, in order to intimidate the whole group, that way preventing the whole group. The whole group could still vote, but nonetheless they are effectively inhibited.

We tried to find a satisfactory word. I think "discourage" is a word, as Senator COOPER says, that in a criminal statute is a little too ephemeral. I found another word in "Black's Law Dictionary." The word is "deter."

To deter is:

To discourage or stop by fear, to stop or prevent from acting or proceeding by danger, difficulty, or other consideration which dis-

heartens or countervails the motive for the act.

Citing a Georgia case, incidentally. Very interesting; it is a southern case. It is the case, if anybody wants it, of *Haynesworth v. Hall Construction Co.*, 44 Georgia Appeals.

That is precisely the word we are trying to reach. I would be delighted if Senator COOPER could see his way clear to conform with what is our problem.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Thirty seconds more.

"Prevent" will not do it. I think "discourage" is too ephemeral. But this is a word of art which is exactly right, and which is exactly in point, and I would hope very much, Mr. President, that Senator COOPER, than whom there is no other Senator I admire more, and anything he says I listen to with my heart as well as my mind, and I wish he would be persuaded, because I think this is right, and I think I want to do exactly what he wants to do.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 14940) to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act, as amended, in order to extend the authorization for appropriations, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 14940) to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act, as amended, in order to extend the authorization for appropriations, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INTERFERENCE WITH CIVIL RIGHTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2516) to prescribe penalties for certain acts of violence or intimidation, and for other purposes.

Mr. COOPER addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PROXMIER in the chair). The Senator from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I yield myself 4 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I wish to say again that although the amendment I have offered may appear to be merely legalistic or technical, it is not so. It deals with a substantive body of law. If the proper language is not substituted in the sections of the bill, I believe it would violate not only the precedent in criminal law but it would also impose sanctions against individuals upon vague grounds. I have studied this language very carefully over the last several days. It appears to me, and I believe I have some agreement even from the sponsors of the bill. If the language is not changed, it would allow a criminal complaint against an individual because of a complainant's state of mind. The complainant might say, "I was discouraged from exercising constitutional rights," or, "I was afraid I could not exercise my constitutional rights." There is no basis in law and there should be no basis in law to convict a man because another says, "I was discouraged."

Mr. President, this is the point and it is one with which I believe the sponsors of the bill should agree.

Furthermore, constitutionally, words alone are not a ground for criminal action unless there is some immediate effect or consequence, such as words which provoke a breach of the peace. People in this country speaking against the Government of the United States, urging revolution, insurrection, and disobedience to law—words that we deplore. I deplore words that are dangerous. But words are not punishable unless they result in criminal action or a present danger. Carmichael and others utter threats against the United States. They are shameful and dangerous. Yet under the Constitution they are protected unless there is a clear and present danger that the acts they recommend might occur.

But under this bill if a person by words discouraged another from voting or exercising other constitutional rights, the person who uttered the words might be charged with a crime. I do not believe that this is right, and I do not believe that there is any basis in law or justice for it.

There has been suggested the word "deter." The word carries the same defect as "discourage," simply that one claiming to be offended might say—subjectively—"I was deterred. I did not exercise my right because something was said which deterred me from doing so."

I shall offer another word in substitution, a word which has a firm grounding in law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's 4 minutes have expired.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized for 3 additional minutes.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I shall ask that the word "discouraged" be deleted and that there be substituted in its place the word "intimidate." The word

"intimidate" is a legal word of art and it has been accepted in law. I shall give the definition of the word "intimidate" from Black's Law Dictionary. It states, "unlawful coercion, duress, being in fear." A number of cases can be cited which show the word "intimidation" as having legal effect and consequences.

In addition, Mr. President, many States have statutes using intimidate in the sense of the bill before us—such as the intimidation of voters.

I offer the word "intimidate" instead of "discourage."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator ask permission to modify his amendments?

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask permission to modify my amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, that one is satisfactory to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] and to me, and at this point we would ask that the Senator take care of his other parts.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, there are several sections of the bill which have the same defect. I have called up amendment No. 556, which is the pending business. I would ask unanimous consent also to call up my amendment No. 595.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator request unanimous consent to make modification of this amendment?

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to modify my amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the modification will be made.

The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 556.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, are we voting on all of them now or just one amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kentucky ask unanimous consent to vote on all amendments?

Mr. COOPER. All that I have offered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, may we have the pagination? I know two now: Page 2, line 21; and page 5, line 5.

Mr. COOPER. The Miller amendments also have the word.

Mr. JAVITS. And page 27, line 1.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments (Nos. 556 and 595) of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], as modified, en bloc. [Putting the question.]

The amendments (Nos. 556 and 595) of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], as modified, were agreed to.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. J. Terry Emerson, who is with the legislative counsel of the Senate, be permitted the privilege of the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is the amendment of the Senator from Illinois number 554, as amended.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Under the unanimous-consent agreement of yesterday, what is to be the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the Senator from West Virginia can be recognized to call up his amendment.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I understand the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] has an amendment which he would like to have considered at this point. I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the unanimous-consent order of yesterday, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] may be recognized to bring up an amendment, after which I may be recognized to bring up my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the Senator from Kentucky if I may see the amendment.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I repeat my unanimous-consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Kentucky is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 567

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I yield myself 4 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky yields himself 4 minutes.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, my amendment has been agreed to by the managers of the bill, but for the purpose of explanation—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator identify his amendment so the clerk can state it?

Mr. COOPER. Amendment No. 567. I call it up and ask that it be made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read by the clerk.

The assistant clerk read the amendment (No. 567), as follows:

On page 4, line 14, after "guests" insert a comma and the following: "other than an establishment located within a building which contains not more than five rooms for rent or hire and which is actually occupied by the proprietor of such establishments as his residence."

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to modify my amendment as follows—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the modification.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask that the modification be read.

The assistant legislative clerk read the modification, as follows:

On page 5, line 22, after the period insert a new sentence as follows: "Nothing in subparagraph (2) (F) or (3) (A) of this subsection shall apply to the proprietor of any establishment which provides lodging to transient guests, or to any employee acting on behalf of such proprietor, with respect to the enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations of such establishment if such establishment is located within a building which contains not more than five rooms for rent or hire and which is actually occupied by the proprietor as his residence."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the modification? Without objection, the modification is made.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

First, let me say that the amendment which I have offered has nothing to do with title II of the bill before us which deals with "Fair Housing." The amendment which I have offered deals with public accommodations.

The amendment which I have offered does not create any new exemption in the present law regarding public accommodations. The Senate will remember that Congress wrote into the Civil Rights Act of 1964 an exemption which was called the "Mrs. Murphy" exemption. The first time I ever heard of the expression was when my seat mate, the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken], spoke of those who should be allowed to operate their small roominghouses without interference and termed them "Mrs. Murphy" enterprises. Thus the exemption was written into the law by Congress. It is the law today. My amendment would define in this bill the rights protected in connection with the portion of existing law known as the "Mrs. Murphy amendment."

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, may we have order so that the speaker may be heard?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. COOPER. The 1964 Civil Rights Act does not give a right to any individual to obtain lodging in a "Mrs. Murphy" type boardinghouse of five rooms or less, for such category of boardinghouses are exempt under the provisions of title II, section 201(b)(1) which reads as follows:

Any inn, hotel, motel or other establishment which provides lodging to transient guests, other than an establishment located within a building which contains no more

than five rooms for rent or hire and which is actually occupied by the proprietor of such establishment as his residence.

Second, there is no corresponding exemption in the pending Dirksen substitute covering boardinghouses of five rooms or less.

Third, therefore, the Dirksen substitute subjects a proprietor of a "Mrs. Murphy" type boardinghouse to criminal liabilities if the proprietor takes steps to remove a prospective tenant who will not leave when she demands it even though the prospective tenant has no Federal rights to lodging in her boardinghouse.

Under sections 245(b)(2)(F) and 245(b)(3)(A), of the Dirksen substitute, a present or prospective tenant is protected against interference because of race or color in his right to enjoy accommodations in all types of boardinghouses, including boardinghouses of five rooms or less. The tenant's protection extends to interference by the proprietor as well as by outside third parties. Under 245(b)(3)(A), not only the tenant or prospective tenant but also civil rights workers aiding a tenant are protected against interference by the proprietor or outside third parties.

Mr. President, my amendment would make the following changes:

First. A present or prospective tenant of a boardinghouse remains protected against interference because of race or color by the proprietor or by outside third parties, except that where a boardinghouse contains but five rooms or less the proprietor would be exempted from section 245(b)(2)(F).

Second. This exemption for a proprietor of a boardinghouse of five rooms or less would also be incorporated in paragraph 245(b)(3)(A). Under this provision civil rights workers who may be aiding a tenant or prospective tenant obtain lodging in a boardinghouse continue to be protected against interference by the proprietor or by outside third parties but where the boardinghouse contains but five rooms or less the proprietor would be granted an exemption.

Third. My amendment would make no change in section 245(b)(3)(C) which will continue to apply to protect a proprietor from interference by outside third parties with the proprietor's desire to provide lodging to minority groups, notwithstanding that the number of rooms of the boardinghouse may be less than five.

As I say, my modified amendment does not create any new exemption, but simply makes clear the protections which would apply in any event, under "Mrs. Murphy" provisions.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, on my time?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. HART. All of us sense the problem to which the Senator from Kentucky, by his amendment, seeks to respond. I understand that he has given some thought to the possibility that the phrase "the proprietor of any establishment which provides lodging," which is included in his amendment, might better read "the proprietor of any establishment covered under this section solely because it provides lodging."

Mr. COOPER. The language which I

have used is the language of the "Mrs. Murphy" exemption in existing law. Why is that not sufficient?

Mr. HART. Only for the reason that there is a possibility that a different type of facility, let us say a restaurant, which is covered under the earlier act, might also make available several rooms for transients, and the amendment, unless it is clarified as I suggested the Senator from Kentucky might want to clarify it, might thus be construed to exempt that restaurant. In other words a facility otherwise covered by the language of the bill might seek to evade coverage by placing itself in addition under the language of this amendment.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I think we would run into difficulty if we should change the language. I understand what the Senator from Michigan is trying to do. But the "Mrs. Murphy" amendment was adopted in 1964, and was interpreted at that time. It was made clear that it could not evade its purpose. I believe the interpretation in that act would be sufficient to take care of any case where someone wrongfully and unlawfully tried to evade the law and its purpose.

I think if we change the existing language, we may create more problems; but as a part of the interpretation of this amendment, I will agree that the example the Senator has given would be a valid one.

Mr. HART. On that basis, perhaps we have gone as far as we should push.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment (No. 567) of the Senator from Kentucky, as modified.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JAVITS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRUENING in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE— ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 2419) to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, with respect to the development of cargo container vessels, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

The message communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. Joseph W. Martin, Jr., former Member of the House for 21 consecutive terms, and Speaker of the House of Representatives of the 80th and 83d Congresses, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

VIETNAM MISSION—A RETURN TO FIRST PRINCIPLES

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial entitled "Vietnam Mission: A

Return to First Principles," published in the Washington Post of yesterday, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VIETNAM MISSION: A RETURN TO FIRST PRINCIPLES

It is hard to argue against the need for additional American troops in Vietnam to regain the initiative lost in recent weeks. If our forces already on hand are endangered by being spread too thin, they must be reinforced. But the dispatch of more troops by itself will not answer the critical questions:

What will we do with the initiative when we regain it, and what is to stop the enemy from trying to gain it back?

Is there not some upper limit to the effectiveness of these reflexive responses, beyond which the risk of wider war outweighs any conceivable gain in the security and stability of South Vietnam?

Which is more likely to persuade Hanoi to negotiate or simply back away—ever-increasing applications of American firepower and manpower, or a sustained and restrained demonstration of American staying-power and of steadily increasing South Vietnamese capacity to find their own salvation by themselves?

These were valid questions before the Tet offensive. They are all the more valid now. For the critical new element in the war is not necessarily to be found in the tide of battle. History records that it can turn again—and again. The new element is the near certainty that a burden and a sacrifice which have been borne narrowly by professional soldiers and draftees and that relatively small segment of the American public directly touched by casualties is now about to be spread more widely over the populace as a whole. We are reaching the end of those readily available resources in manpower and money which have permitted us for so long to engage in a war larger than Korea without seriously disrupting the life of the average citizen. Proposals for higher taxes, economic controls, reserve callups, and deeper draft calls must almost surely accompany any substantial increase in our fighting forces.

So there are going to be new doubts and a broader, more intense debate. And because dissent is the natural enemy of a strategy which rests so heavily on the appearance of resolve, it is all the more urgent that these deliberations be purposeful; that the outer boundaries of our realistic options be fully recognized; that, at long last, there be an understanding of the restraints and inhibitions in a limited war for limited ends.

It may even be necessary to begin by acknowledging miscalculation—or failure—in the strategy that has carried us from the Tonkin resolution of 1964, to the first tentative landing of combat troops in early 1965 and the beginning of the bombing of the North, and on to the present involvement of more than 500,000 United States combat troops in a struggle with no clearly visible end-result in sight.

At the outset, there was a reason for projecting an open-endedness to our effort. We were embarking on a campaign of "graduated response" to enemy initiatives. By carefully measuring each increment, while leaving open our readiness to widen the war if need be, the idea was to persuade the North Vietnamese to back down, or at least back off, without provoking a confrontation with the Russians or the Chinese. In the early stages, when we had more scope for enlarging our effort in relative safety, there was more reason to hope that this steady intensification of pressure would prevail.

There are some who now say that just one more increase in our application of military pressure will do the trick. Perhaps it will. But

we should be prepared, by past experience, for the possibility—indeed the probability—that it won't. And we must frankly recognize that if it doesn't, there is nothing in our current strategy that would logically argue against yet another expansion of our effort, and another, and another.

This prospect is surely grim enough to encourage a re-evaluation of our Vietnam mission, and a return to first principles.

The first principles were easier to state in August, 1964, when Senator Thurmond asked Secretary Rusk, at hearings on the Tonkin Resolution, whether "we have a policy to win the Vietnam war so we can get out of there, or are we going to stay in there indefinitely?" Mr. Rusk replied:

"I think a highly relevant factor here is that there are a billion and a half people in Asia, half of them in the Communist world and half of them in the Free World. I don't see how we are going to get a long-range solution to this problem on the basis of our trying to go in there, into this vast mass of people, and try to do a job as Americans in lieu of Asians. I think that it is important for us to try to assist those Asians who are determined to be free and independent to put themselves in a position to be secure."

Harking back to other strictly limited American efforts of the same sort, such as in Greece, Mr. Rusk added:

"These and other problems have all been troublesome and difficult and hard to manage, but the end result it seems to me, ought to be a stable situation with free and independent nations capable of maintaining their own security rather than to try to bring everything to a great cataclysm because, on that basis, there isn't much to settle any more in terms of organized societies maintaining their own independence."

It would be too much to say that Vietnam has now reached the verge of "cataclysm" or that "there isn't much to settle anymore" in terms of an organized society maintaining its own independence. But there is little evidence, in the second readings now being given to the ravages of the Tet offensive, that the South Vietnamese are close, or even getting closer, to the day when they can "put themselves in a position to be secure." Indeed, there is more reason than ever to wonder whether an increasingly more massive American military effort does not sap the will of the South Vietnamese to perform that part of the "pacification" effort which President Johnson and President Kennedy have both agreed "only they can do for themselves."

If an overbearing American presence does not necessarily encourage the self-determination that is at the core of our hopes for South Vietnam, a towering preoccupation with Vietnam, already absorbing so much of our resources, does not necessarily encourage confidence in the American commitment to promote self-determination as a universal principle. We could keep our pledge to South Vietnam and in the process consume our capacity or wear thin our will to make our pledges meaningful elsewhere in the world.

This is the heart of our dilemma and rarely has it been more concisely stated in the recent study by a group of 14 Asian scholars, including some of the Administration's most sympathetic supporters. Few analyses have been more fervent in support of our Asian role and our Vietnam mission. But few have stated more eloquently the need for "flexibility" and acceptance of "complexity" for the concept of "partial commitment" and the avoidance of extremes.

"Nothing would do more to strengthen American support for our basic position," the report declared, "than to show a capacity for innovation of a de-escalatory nature, indicating that there is no inevitable progression upwards in the scope of the conflict. Such a step or steps need not—indeed should not—be massive. Moreover they should be

experimental in character, subject themselves to alteration if necessary.

"At stake, however, is a principle essential to the survival of the policies of limitation."

There is going to be debate, a people suddenly confronted with a spreading war burden will want to know why and to what end. There will inevitably be increased pressure from the extremes—to get out, or to get on with it by any means. More than ever there is now a need for sober consideration of alternatives: of military redeployment away from the frontiers to force the enemy to move further from its safe havens and supply sources; of a more passive role for American forces and a more active one for the South Vietnamese; of greater emphasis on pacification among the people, less on search-and-destroy and body counts; of a return, in short, to first principles.

While we are compelled to deal now with the crisis at hand, we need at the same time to clarify our concepts of this country's mission and settle on methods consistent with realistic and conservative estimates of our capabilities and with careful count of the risks we are prepared to run. There is no doubt a strong impulse to seek a quick decision by expanding firepower and increasing manpower; but it may be more effective to demonstrate our staying power and our sticking power. The knowledge that this country is willing to carry on a sustained effort and wage a prolonged although limited war might constitute a greater enemy deterrent and a larger inducement to accept a negotiated or de facto settlement.

MARTIN LUTHER KING'S NEW MOVE

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a column entitled "King's New Move and Rights Today," written by Marquis Childs, and published in the Washington Post of yesterday, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KING'S NEW MOVE AND RIGHTS TODAY (By Marquis Childs)

At the moment when a concerted civil rights movement could bring effective pressure for some of the goals set by the riots commission, the leaders are riding off in all directions. The promise to shut down the capital with "civil disobedience" by Martin Luther King Jr. and his crusade of the poor has further splintered civil rights forces.

Several of his once-loyal allies are opposed to the call for civil disobedience. At a show-down meeting with King calling for a pledge of support Joseph L. Rauh Jr., Washington civil rights leader, said he would have no part of it. This was received in frigid silence by King's far-out backers. Since then Bayard Rustin, a close associate, has pulled away.

As the dissenters see it, King is abandoning the political process. Out of his own frustration and personal failure he is about to engage in an adventure outside the law that can only stiffen the opposition in Congress to all civil rights legislation.

The one-vote margin for cloture in the Senate is testimony to how close the division is. It took an unprecedented four tries to get debate stopped so there could be action on a rights bill with a moderately strong open housing provision. To have failed in that fourth attempt would have been a devastating comment on the report of the riots commission which rated an open housing statutes as essential to meaningful integration.

The House must take up the bill the Senate is expected to pass and the opposition

to open housing there is stiffer. The King eruption coinciding with House consideration could solidify the opponents and kill the whole effort.

Quite apart from the political effect, the hazards of King's crusade are great. He intends to set up a tent city in which several thousand demonstrators, from all over the country, will live during the weeks that he means to show the power of the Negro poor and thereby compel swift action by Congress.

The proposed site of the tent city is the Mall extending from the Lincoln Memorial to the Capitol. This would accommodate at least 3000 demonstrators who would then be free to fan out into the city. If King goes through with what he has threatened they would close down main thoroughfares, National Airport, the Capitol Plaza and other focal points.

But neither the Administration nor the new city government can permit this. Elaborate preparations are well along to insure against serious disruption to the city's life. Police will be backed by Army regulars trained in riot control and theoretically capable of restraining demonstrations that get out of hand without violence.

An ominous parallel suggests what political dynamite is inherent in King's crusade. In 1932, unemployed veterans marched on Washington to demand that Congress act immediately on a bonus. In improvised shacks they camped on the Anacostia flats and promised to stay put until they got a bonus bill. President Herbert Hoover ordered troops under Gen. Douglas MacArthur, chief of staff of the Army, to disperse them. The bonus marchers fled before helmeted soldiers using tear gas.

Obviously, President Johnson cannot use that tactic. But neither can he allow the demonstrators to camp on the Mall in the heart of the city. If they are dispersed without a place to pitch their tents the Government will have to pay their fares back where they came from.

Thanks to King, the civil rights drive is tangled with the movement against the Vietnam war. That helps to explain the opposition of Rauh and other one-time allies. Rauh is working intensely for Sen. Eugene McCarthy's independent candidacy in the conviction that within the political process this is a way to express opposition to the Johnson policy on the war.

Civil disobedience can only hurt McCarthy's campaign and play the game of Administration strategists who jump the opposition with the bearded and the beatniks, the draft burners and the revolutionaries outside all law and order. It will tend to discredit the thousands of young people devoting every spare moment to the organized effort for McCarthy.

It seems a long time ago that those 200,000 marchers moved with such evident good nature, hope and cheer, on August 28, 1963, down that same Mall. They heard King's eloquent call for unity in the movement for equal rights. That may have been the pinnacle in a career that has been ever since in a descending arc.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Symington in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting

nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INTERFERENCE WITH CIVIL RIGHTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2516) to prescribe penalties for certain acts of violence or intimidation and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 579

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 579 and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered; and the amendment will be printed in the Record at this point.

The amendment offered by Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, is as follows:

On page 8, lines 4 and 5, strike out "subsection (b) and".

On page 9, line 7, strike out "subsection (b)" and substitute "section 207".

On page 9, beginning with line 8, strike out all through line 2, on page 11.

On page 11, line 5, strike out "sections 203(b) and", and substitute "section".

On page 13, line 11, strike out the section heading "EXEMPTION" and substitute "EXEMPTIONS".

On page 13, line 12, after "Sec. 207", insert "(a)".

On page 13, between lines 20 and 21, insert the following:

"(b)(1) None of the prohibitions contained in this title shall apply to (A) any individual who is not engaged in the trade or business of selling or renting dwellings; or (B) any real estate broker, agent, salesman, or other person while he is acting in accordance with instructions by any individual referred to in clause (A) with respect to the sale or rental of a dwelling owned or rented by such individual.

"(2) For purposes of this subsection an individual shall be considered to be engaged in the trade or business of selling or renting dwellings only if the income from such selling or renting constitutes the principal source of the livelihood of such individual.

"(3) Nothing in this title shall apply with respect to the sale or rental of any rooms or units in a dwelling owned or rented by any individual which contains living quar-

ters occupied or intended to be occupied by no more than four families living independently of each other, if such individual actually occupies one of such living quarters as his residence."

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia withhold that for a moment and yield to me?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Would the Senator tell me whether his amendment refers to three houses or two houses?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. My amendment refers to three.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, would the Senator consider the possibility of having it refer to two houses?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Not at this point.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I would suggest to the attachés that they ask Senators on their sides to come to the floor and listen to the debate, so that we may get on with the business of the Senate. At this rate, not only will we not be able to get out by August 2; we will not get out until Christmas.

SALARIES FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TEACHERS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I want to take these 2 minutes to express myself once again, as chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Education, and as chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Health, Education, Welfare, and Safety of the Senate District Committee, which has jurisdiction over schools, that I have met on two occasions today with separate delegations of schoolteachers from Washington, D.C., who are here at the Capitol having taken a day's vacation from the classroom.

I explained to them, although they were already aware of the views I expressed yesterday, that I hoped they would not stay away from school today. I pointed out to them that I recognized in my speech yesterday that they apparently have the right to do it; and they have exercised that right.

I also pointed out to them that Senator Spong's Fiscal Affairs Subcommittee, of which I am a member, has been willing to consider the Morse teacher's pay bill in a markup session since February 14, but it has not been able to get a report from Mayor Walter Washington on the House passed police and firemen's salary

bill which is essential before we can mark up the teachers' salary bill. We were assured that the report would be filed with our committee either yesterday or today. It was filed yesterday, and I explained to them that Senator Spang had already set March 14 for our executive markup session on the bills and, in my judgment, it would be speedily reported at that meeting.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. MORSE. I ask for an additional 2 minutes, on my own time.

I explained to the teachers—and I want to make it clear to the Senate—that it is very important that the teachers' pay bill not be separated from the pay bill for the policemen and firemen. We know, from past experience, that if we separate the pay bills and proceed to act on the policemen's and firemen's pay bill first, we place the teachers at a disadvantage, unfortunately, as far as obtaining needed pay increases for teachers is concerned. Let there be no mistake about it, I am for adequate pay increases for the firemen and policemen. My subcommittee has jurisdiction over public safety proposals and I want decent salaries paid to the policemen and firemen. We make a great mistake, and misunderstanding develops in the corps of teachers, because they are led to believe that favoritism and a discriminatory advantage has been given to the policemen and firemen over the years.

All I want to say on this occasion is that the Morse teachers pay bill, which seeks a beginning salary for teachers at \$7,000, is a fair bill, and it ought to be passed by the Senate, and we ought to take it to conference with the House. As I told the teachers this morning, our problem is to get action on the matter on the House side. I have some reason to believe that our colleagues on the House side are going to be fair to the teachers and are going to proceed to hold hearings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MORSE. I yield myself 1 more minute.

The fact is that teachers here in the Nation's Capital and for that matter in most areas of the United States, are underpaid.

We taxpayers—and I am one of them—have got to face up to the fact that the teachers of this country are entitled to better treatment than they are getting when it comes to their level of pay.

So when the question is raised with me, "Where are you going to get the money, Mr. Senator?" I give my answer again: "With a \$77.2 billion defense budget, the highest by billions in the history of the Republic, with but \$26 billion of it Vietnam-connected, you can take it out of that budget and never notice it, for you are wasting billions of taxpayers' dollars in unjustifiable defense expenditures all around the world."

That is one of the answers to the teachers' pay problems in America.

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Oregon to answer a question or two on my time?

Mr. MORSE. I shall be happy to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SPONG. I ask the Senator from Oregon if it is not true that—

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for the purposes of my making a unanimous-consent request, with the understanding that he will be recognized immediately thereafter?

Mr. SPONG. I yield.

INTERFERENCE WITH CIVIL RIGHTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2516) to prescribe penalties for certain acts of violence or intimidation, and for other purposes.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to modify my amendment No. 579 in the following manner:

MODIFICATION OF AMENDMENT NO. 579 (BY SENATOR BYRD OF WEST VIRGINIA)

On page 9, lines 11, 12, and 13, strike out "residing in such house at the time of such sale or rental, or who was the most recent resident of such house prior to such sale or rental: *Provided*," and insert in lieu thereof the following: "*Provided*, That such owner does not own more than three such single-family houses at any one time: *Provided further*, That in the case of the sale of any such single-family house by an owner not residing in such house at the time of such sale or who was not the most recent resident of such house prior to such sale, the exemption granted by this subsection shall apply only with respect to one such sale within any twenty-four month period: *Provided further*, That such bona fide owner does not own any interest in, nor is there owned or reserved on his behalf, under any express or voluntary agreement, title to or any right to all or a portion of the proceeds from the sale or rental of, more than three such single-family houses at any one time: *Provided further*,".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from West Virginia? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The amendment will be modified accordingly.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield to me briefly for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. SPONG. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Senator talking on his own time?

Mr. MILLER. On my own time.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment No. 599 be amended to incorporate the language of the Byrd amendment, in the event it is agreed to.

The reason for the request is that, if it is agreed to, it will be impossible to reconcile the two, and if it is not, there will be no problem.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The amendment will be modified accordingly.

SALARIES FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TEACHERS

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, in view of the statement just made by the Senator from Oregon, I wish to ask him, as a member of the Fiscal Affairs Subcom-

mittee, if it has not been the intention of that subcommittee to deal with the teachers' pay bill and the fire and police bill at the same time?

Mr. MORSE. That is my understanding.

Mr. SPONG. And the subcommittee is prepared to consider all of these matters at the same time?

Mr. MORSE. That is my understanding.

I add, since I do not think the Senator from Virginia was here when I made my remarks yesterday, or my earlier remarks at the beginning of my speech today, that the Senator from Virginia, who is chairman of the subcommittee, has stood ready, willing, and waiting to take up this teachers' pay bill as soon as we could get the report necessary for committee consideration from Mayor Washington. We got the report yesterday.

The Senator from Virginia has already set March 14 for our executive markup session on the pay bills. When I was speaking about the problem in regard to seeing to it that the police, firemen, and the teachers are considered together, I was referring to the problem we usually have over on the House side. There has been a tendency in the House to separate it, and that is what creates a legislative problem for us in the Senate. It also creates misunderstanding, I think, between the teachers on the one side and the policemen and firemen on the other.

Mr. SPONG. I thank the Senator from Oregon for clarifying the matter.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum; and this will be a live quorum call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 37 Leg.]

Aiken	Gore	Moss
Anderson	Harris	Murphy
Bartlett	Inouye	Muskie
Boggs	Javits	Pearson
Brooke	Jordan, Idaho	Prouty
Byrd, Va.	Lausche	Russell
Byrd, W. Va.	Magnuson	Spong
Case	Mansfield	Symington
Cotton	Miller	Talmadge
Curtis	Morse	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is not present.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the presence of absent Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, the following Senators entered the Chamber and answered to their names:

Allott	Hansen	Mondale
Baker	Hart	Monroney
Bayh	Hartke	Montoya
Bennett	Hatfield	Mundt
Bible	Hayden	Nelson
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Pell
Burdick	Hill	Percy
Cannon	Holland	Proxmire
Carlson	Hollings	Randolph
Church	Hruska	Ribicoff
Clark	Jackson	Scott
Cooper	Jordan, N.C.	Smathers
Dodd	Kennedy, Mass.	Smith
Dominick	Kennedy, N.Y.	Sparkman
Eastland	Kuchel	Stennis
Ellender	Long, Mo.	Thurmond
Ervin	Long, La.	Tower
Fannin	McClellan	Tydings
Fong	McGee	Williams, N.J.
Fulbright	McGovern	Williams, Del.
Griffin	McIntyre	Young, N. Dak.
Gruening	Metcalfe	Young, Ohio

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

INTERFERENCE WITH CIVIL RIGHTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2516) to prescribe penalties for certain acts of violence or intimidation and for other purposes.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, my amendment No. 579 is pending before the Senate. I have already asked unanimous consent, and that consent has been granted, to modify my amendment; and Senators will find on their desks the modification in part, which reads as follows:

On page 9, lines 11, 12 and 13, strike out "residing in such house at the time of such sale or rental, or who was the most recent resident of such house prior to such sale or rental: *Provided*," and insert in lieu thereof the following: "*Provided*, that such owner does not own more than three such single-family houses at any one time; *Provided further*, that in the case of the sale of any such single-family house by an owner not residing in such house at the time of such sale or who was not the most recent resident of such house prior to such sale, the exemption granted by this subsection shall apply only with respect to one such sale within any 24 month period; *Provided further*, That such bona fide owner does not own any interest in, nor is there owned or reserved on his behalf, under any express or voluntary agreement, title to or any right to all or a portion of the proceeds from the sale or rental of, more than three such single-family houses at any one time; *Provided further*,".

Mr. President, under the language in the substitute by Mr. DIRKSEN, single-family housing is exempted from the "fair housing" provisions only if it is "sold or rented by an owner residing in such house at the time of such sale or rental, or who was the most recent resident of such house prior to such sale or rental."

It will be noted that the language in the Dirksen substitute which I have just read would not exempt the owner of a single-family dwelling in the following situations, among others:

First. An owner, because of health reasons, must go to Arizona for a period of 2 years and wishes to rent his single-family house located in an Eastern State. He rents his dwelling, but 3 months later the tenant moves out. The owner

of the single-family dwelling no longer is the "most recent resident" of his own property and, therefore, is no longer exempted.

Second. A serviceman or a foreign service officer departs overseas on an assignment of considerable duration. He rents his single-family house. Six weeks later the renter moves out. The serviceman—or foreign service officer—is no longer exempted from the coverage of the fair-housing title, inasmuch as he is no longer the "most recent resident."

Third. A widow owns and lives in a single-family dwelling. She also owns a single-family dwelling across the street, the tenant therein being her daughter. The daughter moves to another State. The widow cannot qualify for exemption under the Dirksen substitute because she neither resides in the house across the street—of which she is the owner—nor is the "most recent resident" of such dwelling prior to a subsequent sale or rental.

Fourth. An individual lives in his own single-family dwelling located on a three-quarter-acre lot. He decides to build a second house on the lot. Ten years later misfortune forces him to parcel the lot and sell the house thereon. He does not qualify under the Dirksen substitute exemption because he is neither "residing in" the adjacent dwelling nor was he the "most recent resident" thereof.

I believe, Mr. President, that Senators will want to provide a clear-cut exemption in the case of single-family dwellings, especially when the owner rents or sells the dwelling without the assistance of a real estate salesman or agency; so I have drawn the language in my modified amendment to reach such situations as those I have cited today.

My language would permit the bona fide owner of as many as three single-family dwellings, whether or not he is the resident therein or the most recent resident therein, to sell or to rent, exercising his own preferences in so doing, as long as he did not use a real estate agency or salesman as set forth in the Dirksen substitute.

I have also sought, by the last proviso, to prevent a situation in which an individual could possess three houses, could sell one, could replace that house by purchasing another house, could again sell one, could purchase another house, and never own more than three houses at any one time. For this reason, I have put in the stipulation that there can be no more than one sale, carrying the exemption, in any 24-month period. I have also provided against a sham transaction in which the owner of the house might have his wife as the owner of three houses, his daughter as the owner of three houses, and his son as the owner of three houses, and thus be able, by participating in these sham transactions, to really exercise dominion over a great number of houses—10, 12, 15, 18, and so forth.

I have talked with the floor manager of the bill, Senator HART, and with Senator MONDALE, Senator JAVITS, and Senator BROOKE at length on yesterday about this amendment. I worked with legislative counsel until midnight last night, and

again this morning. I have worked with the Senators named in an effort to reach an understanding and possibly have this amendment adopted by mutual consent, and I wish, at this point, to express my appreciation to them for their sincere and patient efforts to work out a mutually agreeable compromise amendment.

All of us have worked in good faith, but we have reached the point where we feel there will have to be a vote on this proposal because we have been unable to finally work out an amendment to which all parties could agree.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], all agree that these examples I have presented here today are pertinent and valid, and that such situations could very well occur, and I believe I am correct in saying that they, too, feel something should be done to deal with such situations. At the same time, they have reservations about the amendment and, of course, they can express those reservations.

I do hope that after they have done so, we can have a vote, that we will have to wait too long to reach a vote, and that Senators will support my amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Will the Senator permit me to yield on his time?

Mr. AIKEN. On my time. I have 59 minutes and 50 seconds remaining.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. My time is running short.

Mr. AIKEN. I can spare a little time. I am interested in the Senator's amendment. I am wondering why it was necessary to raise the number of houses owned by one party to three. What is the logic in that? The bill itself, I believe, referred to one house, or four rooms.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I have already discussed situations in which which there would be at least two houses involved.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The Senator asked why I used the word "three."

Mr. AIKEN. Yes.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. We have the so-called "Mrs. Murphy" amendment or the "Mrs. Murphy" language in the bill.

Mr. AIKEN. She is a good woman.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Indeed, yes. The Mrs. Murphy language in the bill provides for four units, if the families live independently therein.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. But Mrs. Murphy also has to live in one of those four units.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. That confines its protective reach to three units other than the one in which she lives. In my amendment, therefore, I use "three" as the number, in order to have parallel construction.

Mr. AIKEN. The amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from West Virginia would not permit ownership of three four-unit apartments.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Will the Senator repeat his inquiry?

Mr. AIKEN. Would the amendment of the Senator from West Virginia permit three four-family apartment houses?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. No. These are single-family dwellings only.

Mr. AIKEN. Three single-family dwellings.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. I think that explains it.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, the Senator from West Virginia is correct.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GORE in the chair). The Senate will be in order.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, before the Senator starts, I wonder if he would permit me, on my time, to ask a question of the Senator from West Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I wonder if the Senator can tell us what would happen in the many cases in which Members of the Senate, Members of the House of Representatives, and people serving in the executive branch of the National Government—and the same thing can be multiplied many times on the State level—and in State governments, where those people have a home back where they came from, they acquire a home in the Capital where they are serving, and where, for one reason or another, they may rent for a period of time the dwelling back in their original home State.

A situation similar to that happened in the case of the Senator from Florida in one instance and I am certain that many persons now serving in Washington are in a somewhat comparable situation.

Would the amendment of the Senator from West Virginia take care of that situation?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The answer is yes.

May I say, as the author of this amendment, that I have no single-family dwelling or any other type of dwelling back in my State. The only property I own is a house in Arlington in which I presently live. So this amendment was not devised to take care of any situation of mine or of any specific individual.

However, in answer to the Senator's question regarding Members of Congress and persons serving in the executive branch who may have a dwelling back in their home States, as well as a dwelling here in the Nation's Capital, in such a case this amendment would adequately treat the situation. But without this amendment, if Senator X should rent his home, back in the State from which he came, while he is serving in the Senate, and 3 months after having rented the dwelling, the Senator loses his renter, the Senator no longer being a resident in that dwelling, and he no longer being the most recent resident therein, he then, of course, is boxed in by the language in the Dirksen substitute.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I am glad

to yield to the Senator from North Carolina on his time.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. I have an entire hour and I do not mind squandering it a little.

When the Senator from Florida brought up his question, it brought to my mind a case that could easily happen where a person would own three dwellings. I know we have people who have a summer home or a winter home. There are some people with a home in Florida and a home in the mountains of western North Carolina, in addition to a home here, and a home in their home State. One could easily have three homes.

I know one Member of Congress who has a home which he rents all of the time because he is only there a part of the year. He has another situation where he rents a home in the mountains of western North Carolina. He rents that home some time in the summertime because he is not there. He would be trapped unless this amendment were adopted, in the three room situation.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The Senator is correct.

I am not concerned about the Senator who is trapped or the House Member who is trapped by the Dirksen substitute. Senators and Members of the House of Representatives have the option of voting for or against the Dirksen substitute. If they want to vote for or against the Dirksen substitute on the basis of how it affects their personal situation that would be up to them, although I am confident that they would not cast their vote on a personal basis.

I would like to make clear that this amendment was not prepared nor is it being offered with regard to Senators or Members of the House of Representatives. They can vote against the entire bill if they wish to do so. But I do feel there are bona fide property owners throughout our country who are not Senators or Members of the House of Representatives, and who have no opportunity to vote for or against the bill, or to express in debate their sentiments thereon, who will be affected by this bill, and who will be affected by our own votes in connection with this bill. We should try to find some reasonable way in which to deal with their situations, examples of which I have cited here today.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield to the Senator from North Carolina on his time.

Mr. President, may we have order?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. On my time.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, would the Senator suspend while we get order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will be in order.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President—

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, would the Senator suspend while we get order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will not resume until we get order. The Chair reminds the visitors in the galleries to please maintain quietude.

Discussion and debate is underway in the Senate of the United States and it deserves respectful attention.

The Senator may proceed.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I use those examples because I am aware of that situation in the Nation's Capital. But I know of a number of people in the same situation in which the same thing would apply to them. It is not a matter for us one way or another but it will affect a great many more people than one would think.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I thank the Senator and agree with him.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, the Senator from West Virginia properly observed that Senators HART, JAVITS, BROOKE, and myself attempted over the past day and a half to deal with this problem. I would want to clarify one thing. I think I speak for them when I say that none of us felt this exemption was necessary and, indeed, all of us believe that there should be no exemption for the sale of any home or the rental of any premises offered to the public whether through a broker or not. In order to arrive at what is now known as the Dirksen substitute, we agreed to exempt the sale or rental of owner-occupied single-family dwellings when not sold through a broker after January 1, 1970. We did so reluctantly. We regret that it was necessary to do so. I still believe that one of the basic and fundamental objections to discrimination in the sale or rental of housing is the fact that through public solicitation the Negro father, his wife and children are invited to go up to a home and thereafter to be insulted solely on the basis of race.

So that what we are trying to do is to make an accommodation in light of the realities of the current legislative situation. But we were unable to do so. The amendment of the Senator from West Virginia, as modified, is, in my opinion, much reduced in scope from that originally proposed. It would, however, for the first time, introduce into the Dirksen substitute an additional category of possible exemption; namely, the nonowner-occupied single-family dwelling when not sold through a broker. The Senator from West Virginia, I, and others, have tried to develop ways strictly to limit that extension. Although various steps have been taken, I personally am not satisfied that we have been able to cut off all the possibilities for circumvention.

The Senator from West Virginia seeks to do so by limiting the scope of his exception to single-family dwellings, by limiting it to an owner who owns no more than three homes, by limiting it to sales not in excess of one for every 2 years, by counting within the limit of the three units of such sale not only property that in fact rests in the name of that owner, but also the property in which he has equitable ownership.

In my opinion, all of these efforts substantially restrict the impact of the proposal offered by the Senator from West Virginia. But, and I must be frank, I see no reason to do it. One of my colleagues said, "We have to get people out of this fix." I do not see it that way. I do not

see that we are granting anything or giving anything. We are merely removing from that transaction—and hopefully from the transactions covered within the scope of the Dirksen substitute—the right to deny someone the opportunity, along with all other Americans, to bid and be considered on the purchase of a home or on the rental of premises without regard to color.

So far as I am concerned, it makes utterly no difference that a broker is not used. It is still a public sale. It is still an insult. It is still discrimination. In my opinion, it is still a moral outrage. But, that decision has been made, and I fear that the additional step, although much reduced in scope, might contain—not through design of the author, but because we have not had time thoroughly to explore the matter—other possibilities for circumvention which we are unable to uncover on the basis of exploring it fully in the limited time we have now.

I express my great appreciation to the Senator from West Virginia for his almost unimaginable patience with me during this past day and a half. I know that I speak also for the other sponsors of the measure. But we must, reluctantly, oppose the amendment.

There is one other curbing feature, too, that I think we should explain; namely, that under the Dirksen substitute there is a definition of a person who is in the business of selling or renting dwellings. It appears on page 10 of the star print, and provides in subsection (c) that—

... a person shall be deemed to be in the business of selling or renting dwellings if—
(1) he has, within the preceding 12 months, participated as principal in three or more transactions ...

Mr. President, it is quite clear that this means where a person sells an owner-occupied home, not through a broker, three or more times in a single year—that is, keeps moving—so that he becomes, under the definition of this statute, a person in the business of the sale or rental of dwellings.

The subpart (2) puts a person in that category if he has, within the preceding 12 months, participated as an agent to sell someone else's home or to rent someone else's premises in two or more transactions.

The amendment of the Senator from West Virginia would, as it is presented, incorporate and be related to those two provisions. If someone were trying to conform to the terms of the amendment as modified by the Senator from West Virginia—to participate in the real estate business of selling or renting—I think the law is quite clear that he would, if he sold his own home three times or more in a single year, or rented someone else's premises, or sold someone else's premises more than twice a year, become a person in the business of selling or renting property.

This would prohibit sham or fraudulent transactions in order to evade the limits of the proposed amendment. But it is difficult to make certain that we have anticipated every possible way to avoid it.

Finally, we do not see any good reason

or justification, in the first place, for permitting discrimination in the sale or rental of housing. What we are saying is that the concept that the owner—on making a public sale, or the owner on renting a house—should enjoy the opportunity to discriminate against a fellow American solely on the basis of race, is something we find fundamentally objectionable. We cannot accept it. We oppose it. We admit that we have made some compromises. We do not want to make any more.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I have attempted by my language to obviate the situation to which the Senator has referred, in which a real estate operator would attempt to utilize this language as a gimmick and sell house after house, or transact rental after rental, and thus circumvent the purpose and intent of the legislation.

May I say that my original amendment provided for one sale within a 12-month period; and after lengthy discussion with Senator MONDALE, Senator HART, and the other Senators named, I yielded to the extent that I doubled that time period, so it is now a 24-month period as set forth in my amendment.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield—because what we are trying to get at, and I concede that it was at our request that it was changed, where he continues to be the owner of the property—

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Yes.

Mr. MONDALE. The Senator's idea was to make it financially impossible for a person to be in the business and do that. I admit the Senator did it at our suggestion.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Yes. Also, at the suggestion of the Senator, I added this language, and I want to read it again, because, in my judgment, we are really splitting hairs if we think that, in view of this language, sham transactions could occur:

Provided further, That such bona fide owner does not own any interest in, nor is there owned or reserved on his behalf, under any express or voluntary agreement, title to or any rights to all or a portion of the proceeds from the sale or rental of, more than three such single-family houses at any one time.

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. May I yield on the Senator's time?

Mr. BROOKE. Yes. Is it the Senator's contention that the words "bona fide" will eliminate the small builder or developer of housing who, under the Senator's amendment, would be able to, say, occupy one of the houses with his wife and son and daughter, both of whom were 21 years of age or over, and then to give a house to his wife and one to his son and one to his daughter, and then have them exempted so they could sell additional houses, and thereby still be in the business of selling and developing houses and be exempted from the discriminatory provision?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. That is precisely the kind of situation which I think would be prevented especially by the final proviso of this amendment. As

to the house in which he lives with his wife, he is the bona fide owner thereof; but this language would prevent him from having three houses in his name, three in his daughter's name, three in his son's name, and three in his wife's name and thus making an end run around the intent of the language.

Mr. BROOKE. I certainly applaud the distinguished Senator's intent to not include the end run, but what is the language upon which the Senator bases his conclusion?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Again yielding on the Senator's time, if I may—

Mr. BROOKE. On my time.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The language is as follows:

That such bona fide owner—

That is part of the language that I think would be preventive in nature—

does not own any interest in, nor is there owned or reserved on his behalf, under any express or voluntary agreement—

Any express or voluntary agreement, I repeat, between him and his wife, him and his daughter, him and his son—

title to or any rights to all or a portion of the proceeds from the sale or rental of, more than three such single-family houses at any one time.

I cannot see how, with this language in the bill, and the delimiting language which is already in the Dirksen substitute concerning persons who are in the business of selling real estate, et cetera, that this language could possibly leave a loophole.

Mr. BROOKE. The donee of property can still be a bona fide owner; is that not true? If the property is given by the head of the family to his wife, his wife is still the bona fide owner of that property, even though she received that property by virtue of a gift rather than a purchase.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. But there would be reserved on his behalf by his wife the right to the proceeds, and this language obviates that.

Mr. BROOKE. The Senator means thereby that if the wife gets the proceeds, the proceeds are not really the wife's proceeds, but the proceeds belong to the husband?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, it seems to me that in such a situation his wife would be making a voluntary agreement with the husband to let him use these proceeds.

Mr. BROOKE. The Senator says the language prevents that situation?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. In my judgment, it does. I think this language is so tightly drawn that the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, or eventually a court, if such a case reaches a court, would see through this kind of subterfuge and could get behind it. It is my desire and my intent, and as the author of the amendment I make this statement as a part of the legislative history, that the language be so interpreted that such a sham transaction could not be exempted. It is not the purpose of this language to permit one to do indirectly that which one cannot do directly.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. MONDALE. Would the Senator include in his interpretation of the meaning of his amendment, interest held by an individual through a corporate structure or corporate structures, or could a person circumvent the meaning of the Senator's proposal by the creation of multiple corporate ownership?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. We are talking about private individuals, which, it seems to me, eliminates companies, partnerships, corporations, et cetera.

Mr. MONDALE. In other words, it is the Senator's interpretation of his amendment that a corporation—corporate ownership—cannot come within the meaning of his exemption?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Absolutely, and in my original language I used the language "private individual." I do not know how that ever fell out of it.

Mr. MONDALE. May I suggest that it be put back in?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. May the Chair inquire out of whose time the time for this debate is coming? The time of the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. MONDALE. Yes.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The Senator has used a lot more time. Let it be taken out of mine.

Mr. MONDALE. Yes.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I would be willing, if I am granted unanimous consent to do so, to insert the words "private individual" preceding the word "owner". I ask unanimous consent to so modify my amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? Without objection, the amendment is so modified.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

It is very important, first, that we understand the limitations of this amendment. I am not for it, and I am going to vote "nay," but I think it is critically important, whatever the Senate does, that we know what we are doing.

As I understand it, this language would now apply to a private individual owner. It would not apply if that owner sought to sell property covered by the proviso to a broker or agent after December 31, 1969. It would also not apply if that particular owner was in the real estate business, as defined in subsection (c) of this very same section, on page 10, from line 10 to page 11, line 2. Finally, it would not apply unless it were a bona fide owner, a normal convenience proposition. This is what the Senator is trying to confine it to.

So there are three distinct exceptions: Selling through a broker or dealer; a person being in the real estate business himself, which disqualifies him as a person; and the other exception to which I have referred.

We worked with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], trying very hard to work out something.

It is my definite view that we have so eroded this section and so reduced its coverage that to have an open-ended proposition, the end of which nobody can anticipate, what we are really doing is opening another door, a way out of the

bill other than the terms of it already agreed on with Senator DIRKSEN, in my judgment, this is an open-ended thing, the end of which I cannot see nor can any of us. The Senator from West Virginia can argue that it is going to have a very narrow reach and that only a few people might be inconvenienced, but we just do not know. Under the circumstances of having the bill materially cut down anyhow, I deeply feel that if we want some kind of representative open-housing statute, we have to vote "No."

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, in order to be absolutely sure that the owner is a private individual owner, I also ask unanimous consent to modify my amendment to delete the word "an" appearing on line 10 of page 9 of the Dirksen substitute and to insert in lieu thereof the words "a private individual."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the amendment is so modified.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified, of the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, we have now spent some time on the discussion of the technical details of this amendment. I think the discussion reflects the fact that it is difficult to know precisely what we are dealing with. The negotiations of the past day and a half were all directed at trying to understand the purposes and trying to limit the application in such a way that it could not be circumvented. What the amendment represents is the product of those efforts.

But the one thing that I want to make absolutely clear is that we do not believe that anyone selling or renting property to the public should be permitted to discriminate. We are opposed to all of that. We made certain compromises which are embodied in the Dirksen substitute. When fully effective, the Dirksen substitute will cover approximately 80 percent of the housing in this country. Our original proposal covered approximately 96 or 97 percent, excluding the famous "Mrs. Murphy." This would shave the exemptions further. We do not know by how much; it could be exceedingly modest. But we have no way of really evaluating that.

The fundamental point that we must make, the fundamental point that we want totally understood, is that we see no reason whatsoever for permitting an individual, directly or indirectly, to discriminate in the sale or rental of housing, or expanding these exemptions in any way.

There is another amendment that may be brought up. It would prohibit a broker from discriminating but would let the owner continue to discriminate. That still maintains the assertion of a principle that we find unacceptable. The idea that somehow from inclusion within the bill all kinds of dire consequences will follow does not stand examination.

The bill permits an owner to do everything that he could do anyhow with his property—insist upon the highest price, give it to his brother or to his wife, sell it to his best friend, do everything he could ever do with property, except re-

fuse to sell it to a person solely on the basis of his color or his religion. That is all it does. It does not confer any right. It simply removes the opportunity to insult and discriminate against a fellow American because of his color, and that is all. What we are determined to do is to remove this blight from American society.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the truth about the bill is that it gives to men of one race the freedom to deny to men of other races their freedom.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, what the bill does is to make race irrelevant, which is the foundation of this country.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, it does nothing of the kind. The whole bill is based on race. What is being done is to make race the central feature of the bill, instead of making race irrelevant.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes, or so much thereof as I may need.

I think there is entirely too much talk about race and color and too little talk about individual rights. I myself have lived through two periods when my home was occupied by others. One was when I was serving 4 years as the Governor of my State, at its capital, when I was glad to lease my little home to one who was serving in the Air Force at a little airfield just outside my hometown.

Since that time, and since I came to the Senate, we have had one of our children there for 3 years, because of a critical situation in that family, and we have had another child there for 1 year.

Our house is not for sale, and never will be, Mr. President, as long as I live, because we have lived there for nearly 50 years. It is our home. Our children have been born there. We have added to it room by room as the children came along. We accumulated neighbors, some of whom came there because of us, we think. We live there in peace and harmony.

This is not solely a question of race. We would not sell to a convicted felon. We would not sell to a notorious gambler. We would not sell to anybody who did not conform to the high standard of morals and the high tone of the neighborhood where we live in our little home.

I see nothing wrong, either, about our remembering that right here in the Capital, in the legislative department, more than 500 Members of Congress are in somewhat the same situation, because most of us retain our homes back where we came from. How many thousands there are in other departments, I do not know, because I have no means of knowing. How many thousands there are in State capitals, serving in the same way, I do not know. How many hundreds of thousands there are in the Armed Forces and in the Foreign Service, the AID program, and other programs, who are away from home right now, I do not know. This is a confused and widely scattered Nation, and those persons have the right to rent their homes or to lease them.

We may not want to rent or lease our homes. Most of us do not want to do so. But hundreds of thousands of Americans, right now, who are away from home, do want to lease their homes and not lose

any rights in them, including the right to sell them to persons of their own choosing.

This is not a question of color. This is not a question of race. The fact is that there are such things as property rights and individual preferences of many kinds, but they seem to be forgotten because we have, just now, the fetish of trying to be a little fairer—and I hope we can lawfully be fairer—to a minority race.

We have overstated the question of color and race in the debate, and we have understated, in my humble judgment, the fact that there are such things as property rights, individual rights, and individual preferences when it comes to selling or leasing one's property, especially our homes.

An individual who owns a home owes a strong moral obligation to his neighbors and friends among whom he has lived for a period or for decades. I do not think we can ignore this fact.

I hope that the amendment of the Senator from West Virginia will be adopted, because I think it will take care of one difficult problem in connection with the general objectives of the bill.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I want to be absolutely fair to the opponents of my amendment. I want to be certain in my own mind that the language will do what I think it will do and have said it will do or not do.

RESCISSION OF PREVIOUS MODIFICATION OF AMENDMENT NO. 579

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my previous unanimous-consent request, which eliminated on line 10 of page 9 the word "an" and substituted in lieu thereof the words "a private individual," be vacated.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from West Virginia. The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent with respect to the word "owner," which appears three times in my modified amendment, that I be allowed to insert the words "private individual" preceding the word "owner" in the first instance in which it appears; that the word "an" be deleted just preceding the second time the word "owner" appears, and that in lieu thereof the words "a private individual" be inserted; and that the words "private individual" be inserted just preceding the word "owner" the third time that word appears.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his request?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, in the meantime, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, let me get my unanimous-consent agreement first.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I withdraw my request for the yeas and nays.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, this modification is to make it absolutely clear and to nail it down that the owner of the single-family dwellings must be a private individual owner, and not a person created by law.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tem-

pore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, is it the clear intention of the Senator from West Virginia to exclude clearly from the scope of this exemption in every respect corporate ownership?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Yes, indeed it is.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from West Virginia? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The amendment is accordingly modified.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I regret deeply being in opposition to my good friend, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], who I think has done a very fine job in the U.S. Senate. However, I must say that I can see no reason why we should say that the privilege of selling or renting property is any more important than the privilege to acquire property. It is the same privilege on the opposite side for any individual in this country. Whenever we say that for a certain reason a person can determine to whom he can sell, but in no case can he determine from whom he will acquire property, we have then created an inequity between two groups that I think is wrong. It is for that reason that I ask for the yeas and nays on the pending amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified, of the Senator from West Virginia.

On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] is absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY] would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Rhode Island would vote "nay" and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is absent by leave of the Senate because of death in his family.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] is detained on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] is paired with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea" and the Senator from Rhode Island would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 48, nays 45, as follows:

[No. 38 Leg.]

YEAS—48

Aiken	Gruening	Miller
Anderson	Hansen	Mundt
Baker	Hayden	Murphy
Bartlett	Hickenlooper	Pearson
Bennett	Hill	Prouty
Bible	Holland	Randolph
Byrd, Va.	Hollings	Russell
Byrd, W. Va.	Hruska	Smathers
Cannon	Jordan, N.C.	Sparkman
Carlson	Jordan, Idaho	Spong
Church	Lausche	Stennis
Eastland	Long, La.	Talmadge
Ellender	Magnuson	Thurmond
Ervin	Mansfield	Tower
Fannin	McClellan	Williams, Del.
Fulbright	McIntyre	Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—45

Allott	Harris	Montoya
Bayh	Hart	Morse
Boggs	Hartke	Moss
Brewster	Hatfield	Muskie
Brooke	Inouye	Nelson
Burdick	Jackson	Pell
Case	Javits	Percy
Clark	Kennedy, Mass.	Proxmire
Cooper	Kennedy, N.Y.	Ribicoff
Cotton	Kuchel	Scott
Dodd	Long, Mo.	Smith
Dominick	McGee	Symington
Fong	McGovern	Tydings
Gore	Metcalf	Williams, N.J.
Griffin	Mondale	Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—7

Curtis	Monroney	Pastore
Dirksen	Morton	Yarborough
McCarthy		

So the amendment (No. 579), as modified, of Mr. BYRD of West Virginia was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was adopted.

Mr. HOLLAND. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

BUILDUP OF AMERICAN FORCES IN VIETNAM

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I hope I may have the attention of my colleagues.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will please be in order.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I do not wish to detain the Senate too long, but I wish to raise an issue. While it is not directly related to the business now before the Senate, I believe it is indirectly related to it. I had intended to wait until we had completed action on the pending bill, but it is taking much longer than the leadership or I had expected.

There are rumors—or more than rumors—I am quite certain from the news that has come to us through the press and elsewhere, that very significant decisions are being considered by the executive branch of our Government, decisions involving a major new buildup of American forces in Vietnam in the wake of our recent defeats and difficulties in Vietnam—not only a buildup of troops, but also there is the possibility of the extension of the war beyond the geographical limits of Vietnam.

I believe these pending decisions raise a basic and most important constitutional issue which must concern every Mem-

ber of this body, regardless of whether he supports or disagrees with the administration's war policy. This issue is the authority of the administration to expand the war without the consent of Congress and without any debate or consideration by Congress.

The Committee on Foreign Relations has recently considered and reported unanimously a sense of the Senate resolution dealing with this matter, Senate Resolution 187. I would have waited until the resolution was considered later on, except that press reports indicate that decisions are very likely to be made before we get to the consideration of the resolution.

Insofar as the consent of this body is said to derive from the Gulf of Tonkin resolution, it can only be said that that resolution, like any contract based on misrepresentation, in my opinion, is null and void. That resolution was adopted in 1964 on the basis of assurances by the administration that North Vietnamese naval units had deliberately and repeatedly attacked U.S. vessels in international waters, without provocation on our part. Since then, it has become known—and the administration now admits—that the *Maddox* and the *Turner Joy*, the two destroyers involved in that engagement, were engaged in intelligence activities in the Gulf of Tonkin.

In addition, evidence recently uncovered by the committee raises serious doubts as to whether the administration had adequate proof that the alleged attack of August 4 had, in fact, taken place at the time when retaliatory strikes were directed against North Vietnam—the first strikes against that country.

If the administration contemplates an expansion now, a major expansion, or a stepup of the war, it has the obligation, in my opinion, to consult with Congress, especially with the Senate, and to obtain its advance approval.

Mr. President, there have been in the press recently a number of most significant editorials and comments, some of them coming from journals which have consistently gone all out in support of the war policy of the administration. For example, the Washington Post, which I suppose is the most widely read newspaper in this body—except for local papers—for the first time to my knowledge on March 6 in a lead editorial questioned our policies in Vietnam. The editorial was entitled "Vietnam Mission: A Return to First Principles."

Mr. President, I shall not read the entire editorial but I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VIETNAM MISSION: A RETURN TO FIRST PRINCIPLES

It is hard to argue against the need for additional American troops in Vietnam to regain the initiative lost in recent weeks. If our forces already on hand are endangered by being spread too thin, they must be reinforced. But the dispatch of more troops by itself will not answer the critical questions:

What will we do with the initiative when we regain it, and what is to stop the enemy from trying to gain it back?

Is there not some upper limit to the effec-

tiveness of these reflexive responses, beyond which the risk of wider war outweighs any conceivable gain in the security and stability of South Vietnam?

Which is more likely to persuade Hanoi to negotiate or simply back away—ever-increasing applications of American firepower and manpower, or a sustained and restrained demonstration of American staying-power and of steadily increasing South Vietnamese capacity to find their own salvation by themselves?

These were valid questions before the Tet offensive. They are all the more valid now. For the critical new element in the war is not necessarily to be found in the tide of battle. History records that it can turn again—and again. The new element is the near certainty that a burden and a sacrifice which have been borne narrowly by professional soldiers and draftees and that relatively small segment of the American public directly touched by casualties is now about to be spread more widely over the populace as a whole. We are reaching the end of those readily available resources in manpower and money which have permitted us for so long to engage in a war larger than Korea without seriously disrupting the life of the average citizen. Proposals for higher taxes, economic controls, reserve callups, and deeper draft calls must almost surely accompany any substantial increase in our fighting forces.

So there are going to be new doubts and a broader, more intense debate. And because dissent is the natural enemy of a strategy which rests so heavily on the appearance of resolve, it is all the more urgent that these deliberations be purposeful; that the outer boundaries of our realistic options be fully recognized; that, at long last, there be an understanding of the restraints and inhibitions in a limited war for limited ends.

It may even be necessary to begin by acknowledging miscalculations—or failure—in the strategy that has carried us from the Tonkin resolution of 1964, to the first tentative landing of combat troops in early 1965 and the beginning of the bombing of the North, and on to the present involvement of more than 500,000 United States combat troops in a struggle with no clearly visible end-result in sight.

At the outset, there was a reason for projecting an open-endedness to our effort. We were embarking on a campaign of "graduated response" to enemy initiatives. By carefully measuring each increment, while leaving open our readiness to widen the war if need be, the idea was to persuade the North Vietnamese to back down, or at least back off, without provoking a confrontation with the Russians or the Chinese. In the early stages, when we had more scope for enlarging our effort in relative safety, there was more reason to hope that this steady intensification of pressure would prevail.

There are some who now say that just one more increase in our application of military pressure will do the trick. Perhaps it will. But we should be prepared, by past experience, for the possibility—indeed the probability—that it won't. And we must frankly recognize that if it doesn't, there is nothing in our current strategy that would logically argue against yet another expansion of our effort, and another, and another.

This prospect is surely grim enough to encourage a re-evaluation of our Vietnam mission, and a return to first principles.

The first principles were easier to state in August, 1964, when Senator Thurmond asked Secretary Rusk, at hearings on the Tonkin Resolution, whether "we have a policy to win the Vietnam war so we can get out of there, or are we going to stay in there indefinitely?" Mr. Rusk replied:

"I think a highly relevant factor here is that there are a billion and a half people

in Asia, half of them in the Communist world and half of them in the Free World. I don't see how we are going to get a long-range solution to this problem on the basis of our trying to go in there, into this vast mass of people, and try to do a job as Americans in lieu of Asians. I think that it is important for us to try to assist those Asians who are determined to be free and independent to put themselves in a position to be secure."

Harking back to other strictly limited American efforts of the same sort, such as in Greece, Mr. Rusk added:

"These and other problems have all been troublesome and difficult and hard to manage, but the end result it seems to me, ought to be a stable situation with free and independent nations capable of maintaining their own security rather than to try to bring everything to a great cataclysm because, on that basis, there isn't much to settle any more in terms of organized societies maintaining their own independence."

It would be too much to say that Vietnam has now reached the verge of "cataclysm" or that "there isn't much to settle anymore" in terms of an organized society maintaining its own independence. But there is little evidence, in the second readings now being given to the ravages of the Tet offensive, that the South Vietnamese are close, or even getting closer, to the day when they can "put themselves in a position to be secure." Indeed, there is more reason than ever to wonder whether an increasingly more massive American military effort does not sap the will of the South Vietnamese to perform that part of the "pacification" effort which President Johnson and President Kennedy have both agreed "only they can do for themselves."

If an overbearing American presence does not necessarily encourage the self-determination that is at the core of our hopes for South Vietnam, a towering preoccupation with Vietnam, already absorbing so much of our resources, does not necessarily encourage confidence in the American commitment to promote self-determination as a universal principle. We could keep our pledge to South Vietnam and in the process consume our capacity or wear thin our will to make our pledges meaningful elsewhere in the world.

This is the heart of our dilemma and rarely has it been more concisely stated in the recent study by a group of 14 Asian scholars, including some of the Administration's most sympathetic supporters. Few analyses have been more fervent in support of our Asian role and our Vietnam mission. But few have stated more eloquently the need for "flexibility" and acceptance of "complexity," for the concept of "partial commitment" and the avoidance of extremes.

"Nothing would do more to strengthen American support for our basic position," the report declared, "than to show a capacity for innovation of a de-escalatory nature, indicating that there is no inevitable progression upwards in the scope of the conflict. Such a step or steps need not—indeed should not—be massive. Moreover they should be experimental in character, subject themselves to alteration if necessary."

"At stake, however, is a principle essential to the survival of the policies of limitation."

There is going to be debate, a people suddenly confronted with a spreading war burden will want to know why and to what end. There will inevitably be increased pressure from the extremes—to get out, or to get on with it by any means. More than ever there is now a need for sober consideration of alternatives; of military redeployment away from the frontiers to force the enemy to move further from its safe havens and supply sources; of a more passive role for American forces and a more active one for the

South Vietnamese; of greater emphasis on pacification among the people, less on search-and-destroy and body counts; of a return, in short, to first principles.

While we are compelled to deal now with the crisis at hand, we need at the same time to clarify our concepts of this country's mission and settle on methods consistent with realistic and conservative estimates of our capabilities and with careful count of the risks we are prepared to run. There is no doubt a strong impulse to seek a quick decision by expanding firepower and increasing manpower; but it may be more effective to demonstrate our staying power and our sticking power. The knowledge that this country is willing to carry on a sustained effort and wage a prolonged although limited war might constitute a greater enemy deterrent and a larger inducement to accept a negotiated or de facto settlement.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I shall read that part of the editorial which poses the key questions:

What will we do with the initiative when we regain it, and what is to stop the enemy from trying to gain it back?

Is there not some upper limit to the effectiveness of these reflexive responses, beyond which the risk of wider war outweighs any conceivable gain in the security and stability of South Vietnam?

Mr. President, the editorial is long, but this is the point that I wish to emphasize. Is there going to be debate, or will the people suddenly be confronted with an increasing war burden and want to know why and to what end?

What I am suggesting is if there is any group of men in the United States, which has the burden, the duty, and the responsibility to know why and when, it is the Members of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, what I am suggesting is that the Senate—and it can only be by a consensus of this Senate—insist that it be informed as to the nature of widening commitments, if any—and I am confident they are being reviewed—and that we be given the opportunity to debate any prospective widening of commitments.

The principal, and I think the most evil, effect of the Tonkin resolution of 1964, in the setting and under the circumstances in which it was presented, was that it prevented any meaningful debate from taking place in this body. We did not debate the wisdom of that engagement and whether or not the real interest of this United States, of your constituents and mine, is involved in Vietnam.

It is true that one can point to the words of the resolution which say that vital interests of the United States are involved—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield myself one-half minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I submit that is not a valid or a true statement because it was obtained under false pretenses or mistaken facts.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me on my time?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I think the Senator is performing a distinctly important and necessary public service. I join with him wholeheartedly in the call for justification by the administration to this body, to the Congress of the United States, and the people before any major increase in American force in South Vietnam is decided upon.

I think we must insist upon that. Unless Congress takes the responsibility of insisting it be advised of the reason, the justification, and the hopes of this administration we should refuse to go along. I say this because it has been increasingly made apparent to me, at least, and I think to all of us in this body, and to all the American people that there are unexplainable discrepancies between reports that have come back to us from disinterested observers by the score, of the press, magazines, and all media of information who have observed what has been going on in South Vietnam for a long time, and the official optimistic reports that have come to us from the administration, the Department of Defense, and the Department of State.

I think we cannot any longer evade the responsibility of a share in the decision as to whether we are to continue in the present way, for it is now a question as to whether or not the war is winnable without the destruction of South Vietnam and much of American might itself. We must insist that the administration justify any conclusion, that the commitment of additional American forces will not be self-defeating and the cause of possibly great disaster.

I commend the Senator and I join with him.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me on my time?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator.

At the time we had before us the Gulf of Tonkin resolution I cast my vote in favor of it and I did so on the assumption that any military action taken by the President of the United States in the conduct of a war—

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, may we have order? I cannot hear the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. MILLER. I did so on the assumption that the military action taken by the President of the United States in the conduct of a war would be according to the best traditions of our military service. If at that time someone had told me that the conduct of a war after the Gulf of Tonkin resolution would be a prolonged war strategy, and if someone had told me that the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee 2 years later would have found in 1966 that of the thousands of sorties flown over North Vietnam less than 1 percent would be directed at key chief of staff targets, I

would not have supported the Gulf of Tonkin resolution.

I think what should be done—and I have said this all along—is for the administration not only to tell the Senate but also the American people why we must have been enduring a prolonged war policy. If the point is well taken, the American people will accept it. I do not think they will because the point cannot be well taken. But it needs to be taken or something should be done about a change in the conduct of the war.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am not trying to prejudice the substantive matters the Senator raises. Everybody has different views on this. What I am saying is that I think from now on and under conditions now existing, when we know there have been recommendations for very large increases in manpower, and when we hear stories of serious differences in strategy being considered—and I am not privy to those conferences—I think the Senate and the country are entitled to know what those plans are and to have the opportunity to discuss them and arrive at some kind of conclusion as to the validity of these policies.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me on my time?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. HATFIELD. I would like to join with the Senator from Arkansas. This is a subject which has long concerned me, and I wish to thank him for bringing the issue before us at this time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I failed to mention the fact that the Senator's own resolution set my mind to working on this, and I refer to the resolution submitted by him several days ago.

Mr. HATFIELD. I thank the Senator.

I think the question is not whether we dissent from or assent to the present war policy as much as it is a question of what is the proper role that we in Congress should play in the general warmaking policies of our country. I do not think it is a clear-cut issue. I think that lawyers and students of government can determine whether the President is acting with or without legal authority. This question was not easily resolved in the Constitutional Convention.

At the same time, it is incumbent upon all of us to declare our positions so clearly that the President realizes, even though he may have the warmaking power, that Congress has the war declaration power. I think there is a distortion and an imbalance today as to what is the war declaration power of Congress and that which is the warmaking power of the President.

I do not know that my resolution—Senate Concurrent Resolution 63—is going to resolve the matter, but it is clear to me that we in Congress should engage in meaningful dialogue whereby the points can be debated and the constitutional questions raised, especially as relating to the war.

I remind Senators that as far back as 1965 the Americans were suffering about three deaths a week. This figure rose to 26 per week in 1966, 98 per week in 1967, and last week there were 542 American deaths.

In other words, the extent to which we are moving into this war is such that we have reason to question the direction and the trend.

I do not believe that we should sit idly by or, in the name of blind patriotism, say that we endorse everything a President does. By the same token, I think we have a responsibility to challenge; to expect and demand information which will put us in proper balance in the matter of warmaking.

Again I want to commend the Senator from Arkansas. I am hopeful that we will consider this as our duty regardless of our viewpoints.

I happen to be a critic and a dissenter, but I do not think that is the question. We must resolve the question as to what our actual and appropriate role should be in sharing in decisionmaking as to the question of war and peace.

Therefore, I submitted my resolution and hope that we would not try to undo it, because we cannot go backward. But from this point on, Congress should say to the President very clearly that if he deems it vital, if he deems it absolutely necessary, in the interests of our country, to expand the war, we should, therefore, share in the decisionmaking, that it should not be the decision of one man, that it should not be a matter of a President's asking us to ratify that which he has already decided upon.

Congress must be a full, participating partner in this particular warmaking policy that the President has embarked upon.

I want to thank the Senator from Arkansas for making possible this kind of focus upon this matter. I join him on it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I want to reply to the Senator from Oregon by expressing my appreciation of what he has just had to say. His own resolution has certainly sustained me, at this time in particular. He made reference to the Gulf of Tonkin resolution, and the possibility of its repeal. We do not have to go back to repeal it. If one reads the recent hearings of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the testimony of the Secretary of Defense, the resolution has effectively been repealed because it was based upon false representations to the committee. I do not think we could consider that any more valid than we would any other contract based upon false representations. I do not see any need whatever to take any action with regard to a resolution based on any such misapprehensions.

I appreciate the Senator's comments. Mr. JAVITS. Will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator from New York on his own time.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. JAVITS. I wish to speak for 1 minute only to raise one question with the Senator from Arkansas; namely, if we

do have an informal go-around or even a committee hearing or discussion in executive session with those in the administration who might acquaint us with their views, are we not begging the question and have we not been doing so right along, in this sense; that what is really needed is for Senators to debate directly upon this issue on the floor of the Senate. Is that not the challenge, because it will ascertain the temper of the country and the convictions of Senators.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is what I was suggesting.

Mr. JAVITS. Is it not possible for Senators to get untangled from their own feet? The Senator from Arkansas is the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations—a very critically important position—so why could he not bring in some resolution? I have one. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD] has one. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] has one, too. They should be brought before the Senate for discussion and Senators should address themselves to what shall be the policy of the United States upon this burning issue.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If I may respond to the Senator from New York, I think we have already in part achieved that purpose—I think I am confident of that—because very grave reconsideration is now going on. We know that it has been reported in the press that General Wheeler brought back recommendations. We have not been told what they are. In order to provide for free discussion, it seems to me it is the duty of the administration to inform us—the Senate as a whole and my committee as an agent—and submit to the Senate what their present plan is, and the justification for it, and let that be the basis for a full and searching debate upon this question. That is what the Senator is talking about, rather than to have a debate, sort of in the abstract, as to policy.

Mr. JAVITS. In limbo.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is exactly what I have in mind.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield on my own time?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Idaho on his own time.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Arkansas how much I appreciate the importance of the issue he has raised in the Senate this afternoon.

During the Second World War, I served in Asia. I came away persuaded that Asia is an endless morass and that the day of Western control of Asian affairs had passed.

In the years since, we have seen all the other Western nations driven from Asia, one by one. We are the last to keep a foothold on the mainland of Asia.

Mr. President, sometimes I think that we are fascinated by this baited trap. We stand ready today—poised if you will—to plunge still deeper into Asia, where huge populations wait to engulf us, and legions of young Americans are being beckoned to their graves.

That is the issue.

If we are going to fight Asians in Asia with American men, on an ever spread-

ing Asian front, then we had better face it now. We shall soon run out of men and money.

The Constitution vests in Congress a fundamental responsibility in the matter of war and peace. We have abdicated that responsibility in recent years. The last two wars have been Presidential wars.

Now we are at a critical point in determining whether this war shall continue to be a limited engagement or whether it is going to be spread into a general engagement on the Asian mainland.

This is the time to reassert our prerogative, to insist upon full congressional participation in that decision. This is the time.

Afterwards, if we fail to act now, we will be faced once again with the obligation to vote the money, once the troops have been committed and Americans are engaged in an expanding war. That has been our predicament in the past. I would hope that we would heed the words of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations and insist now that Congress be fully included before the next fateful step is taken in enlarging this tragic war.

If we fail now to assert our constitutional responsibilities, we shall have only ourselves to blame for any disaster that the future may hold.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am happy to yield to the Senator from New York, on his own time.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I rise to join the Senator from Arkansas in urging that before any further major step is taken in connection with the war in Vietnam, the Senate be consulted.

No issue which has so divided the United States, in many, many years, as has the war in Vietnam.

There are Senators who disagree with one another. There are Senators who disagree with the executive branch. It seems to me that if we are going to take this step in connection with the war in Vietnam, it would be well to take whatever steps are possible to get concurrence and support of the Senate, and of the American people.

I think it would be a mistake for the executive branch and for the President to take a step toward escalation of the conflict in the next several weeks without having the support and understanding of the Senate, and of the American people.

Everytime we have had difficulty over a period of the past 7 years, over the period during which I was in the executive branch, and since I left the executive branch, the answer has always been to escalate the conflict. It has always been to send more troops. And at the time we sent the larger number of troops, or increased the bombing, we have always stated that there would be light at the end of the tunnel, that victory is just ahead of us.

The fact is that victory is not just

ahead of us. It was not in 1961 or 1962, when I was one of those who predicted there was a light at the end of the tunnel. There was not in 1963 or 1964 or 1965 or 1966 or 1967, and there is not now.

It seems to me if we have learned anything over the period of the last 7 years, it is the fact that just continuing to send more troops, or increasing the bombing, is not the answer in Vietnam. We have tried that. It seems to me something different should be tried.

I know that in the executive branch of the Government different policies have been suggested. I think they should be considered by the Senate of the United States. I think they should be considered by the American people. I do not think we can assume that what we have done in the past is automatically right, any more than the predictions that have been made in the past have been right.

Moreover, there is a question of our moral responsibility. Are we like the God of the Old Testament that we can decide, in Washington, D.C., what cities, what towns, what hamlets in Vietnam are going to be destroyed? Is it because we think it may possibly protect the people of Thailand, the people of Malaysia, the people of Hawaii, or keep certain people out of Texas or California or Massachusetts or New York?

Or do we have that authority to kill tens and tens of thousands of people because we say we have a commitment to the South Vietnamese people? But have they been consulted—in Hue, in Bin Tre, or in the other towns that have been destroyed? Do we have the authority to put hundreds of thousands of people—in fact, millions of people—into refugee camps for their protection—or should these decisions be left to them?

As to our own interests in Vietnam, could not the Germans or the Russians have argued the same thing before the beginning of World War II—that they had the right to go into Poland, into Estonia, into Latvia, into Lithuania, because they needed them for their own protection, that they needed them as a buffer? I question whether we have that right in this country.

It seems to me before we take major steps, to send perhaps 200,000 more troops to Vietnam, that we should ask some very, very significant questions. I would like to know what the purpose would be of sending more American troops there, and what they could accomplish that has not been accomplished by the American troops that are already there.

I would like to know what the people of South Vietnam are going to be willing to do themselves.

If we are going to draft American troops of 18 and 19 years of age and send them to Khe Sanh, Con Thien, and on the border of the demilitarized zone, are we also going to say—as we now are doing—that the people of South Vietnam do not have to draft their own 18-year-old and 19-year-old boys?

When our own marines are going into Hue to recapture it, do we have the right to stand by and merely look at thousands of South Vietnamese looting Hue that has been liberated by us? Do we have to

accept that? Do we have to accept the situation in which we are told that a young man in South Vietnam is running his father's factory because he paid off his draft board and does not have to go?

When this was brought to the attention of the President, he replied that there is stealing in Beaumont, Tex. If there is stealing in Beaumont, Tex., it is not bringing about the death of American boys.

Officials have said, as reported this morning in South Vietnam. Do we have to accept that there is deep-seated corruption that?

Who is our commitment to? Is it to Ky, or to Thieu?

Do we waive the great authority and power of the Senate of the United States by saying we cannot do anything if those in South Vietnam say they are not going to draft their 18- or 19-year-old boys, that they are not going to do anything about corruption, that anybody can buy his way out of the draft, and does not have to fight, even though American boys have been sent and have to stay and fight at the demilitarized zone?

Do we have to accept that in the Senate of the United States? I do not think we have to. I think we can do something about it in the Senate.

I know some have said that we should intensify the bombing in the north. They should be heard. I do not happen to believe that is the answer to the problem, but I do know that what we have been doing is not the answer, that it is not suitable, that it is immoral and intolerable to continue it.

If we are going to continue what we have been doing, when we were told we were just a little way from victory before, and send 100,000 men or 200,000 more men there, the Senate should be consulted and its approval should be received.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The Senator from New York has most eloquently put the issue before us. But whether one agrees with the views of the Senator from New York or my views is not the question I am raising. There are 100 Senators here, representing every citizen of the United States. It seems to me we ought to take the responsibility at this critical hour to see what the administration plans are and their justification and then to make our own judgment on it.

I know that in times past, from the old tribal days, it has always been said that we should follow the leader; that we should get behind the leader, that that is the only way for survival. There is something in that. Under some circumstances, I would do the same. But nobody is claiming that Vietnam is threatening the security of this country. It is not that kind of war, and that is why it is so difficult.

This question requires the judgment of our citizens now before acting otherwise we are going to find ourselves in a situation in which all of us will have to gather behind the leader in a third world war. That is what we are interested in avoiding. I am interested in

helping this administration to avoid any such disaster.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The implication has been made that we have suffered a series of very great defeats in South Vietnam. I do not accept that thesis. I am not saying that we have accomplished a great deal in that unhappy land in the last 6 weeks.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, on my time? If we did not suffer any defeat or difficulty, why is there a request for 200,000 additional troops?

Mr. TOWER. Because now the administration is doing what a number of us have been saying for 2½ years—that you cannot win a war by a graduated response—by a policy of gradualism; that the only way to achieve military victory is through military power, massive air and sea superiority, to achieve the objective at the earliest possible time, with the maximum of impact.

We are confronted with a situation in which a very patient enemy has been led to believe that we are sorely divided, and that if he will only fight long enough and make clever plans for offenses from time to time, we will become weary of the war and that we will give over the country in a veil of surrender or under some face-saving method and get out. I believe that is what this protracted debate has been accomplishing.

The enemy did not succeed in generating a general, major uprising of the citizenry of South Vietnam. He did not succeed in seizing a single city and holding it. He lost thousands and thousands of men. In the first 8 days, he lost over 20,000. A great many of these were hardcore Vietcong guerrillas. The North Vietnamese Army cannot function without them in South Vietnam, and also they are guerrillas that cannot easily be replaced.

I think the major achievement of the the enemy has been to frighten so many people in this country into wanting to get out, into negotiating, into believing that we cannot win, into believing that we are losing and we have to just withdraw unilaterally.

Let us understand the consequences of that. It has been said that we must not be bogged down in the morass of Asia. What would happen should we get out of Asia and let Southeast Asia go? What is going to be the view of the people of that area, who are dedicated anti-Communists, who are making great social and political progress, if America pulls out of Southeast Asia?

What about the great giant of Japan, potentially one of the greatest allies we have, a productive, prosperous country, already asserting leadership in that part of the world?

What about Thailand, which is making great social and economic progress every day?

What about Indonesia, which partially, though not entirely, because of the United States presence there, was able to throw out Sukarno and the Communists, and proceed to rehabilitate its economic and political affairs?

What about Lee Kuan of Singapore?

What about Tung Ku of Kuala Lumpur?

What about Sato, who visited there and asserted his approval of the Saigon government?

Are we going to abandon all this? What are the alternatives proposed by my friends opposite? Do they propose that we proceed to withdraw immediately? If that is the proposition, then perhaps we had better reexamine our position all over the world. Maybe Joe McCarthy was right, if these gentlemen indeed are right, in the view that we should withdraw to "fortress America," assert a neo-isolationism, and forget about the rest of the world.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator from Indiana wish me to yield to him on his own time?

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes, or such time as I may need.

Mr. President, I congratulate the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Senator from New York for their fine statements, and I hope that the resolution of the Senator from Oregon will be speedily acted upon. It certainly should be.

I think the statements made by the Senator from New York were certainly most eloquent. I would call attention to the fact that there are numbers of people in this country quite honestly concerned about where we are going. This matter has even gone so far as to involve the financial community. There is a devastating article in the Wall Street Journal of yesterday, March 6, 1968, which talks about "Dovish Wall Street: Intensification of War in Vietnam Now Causes Big Stock Price Drops—Traders Fear Escalation Will Bring Economic Controls—Peace Rumors Are Bullish, Reversing the 1965 Pattern."

I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I have referred, written by Victor J. Hillery and published in the Wall Street Journal of March 6, 1968, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DOVISH WALL STREET: INTENSIFICATION OF WAR IN VIETNAM NOW CAUSES BIG STOCK PRICE DROPS—TRADERS FEAR ESCALATION WILL BRING ECONOMIC CONTROLS; PEACE RUMORS ARE BULLISH—REVERSING THE 1965 PATTERN

(By Victor J. Hillery)

NEW YORK.—One of the more impressive demonstrations of antiwar feeling is under way these days in about the last place that peace marchers would look for it—Wall Street.

It's a demonstration without banners, slogans or draft-card burnings. But it's unmistakable. On the increasingly rare occasions that rumors of Vietnam peace negotiations circulate, stock prices go up sharply—and that's about the only time they do go up. Whenever the fighting intensifies or threatens to intensify, investors sell shares in enough volume to produce a sharp price break.

Brokerage-house explanations of this pattern echo one of the chief arguments of political "doves"—the argument that the Asian conflict is worsening internal strains in American life and may lead eventually to

a regimented society. Wall Street's version: Escalation in Vietnam is aggravating such economic ills as inflation and the balance-of-payments deficit, and it raises the threat of an economy shackled by Government wage-price controls—the greatest of all investor fears at the moment.

THE BLESSINGS OF PEACE

Some Wall Street descriptions of the potential blessings of peace sound surprisingly New Leftish, too. "Peace in Vietnam would produce a dramatic upsurge in the market—a psychological explosion that would push the Dow-Jones industrial average over 1,000," says Eldon A. Grimm, senior vice president of Walston & Co. (the average closed yesterday at 827.03; its highest close ever was 995.15 in early 1966). Among the reasons Mr. Grimm uses to support his view: "instead of throwing (Government) dollars down a rat hole, they could be spent more beneficially on the rebuilding of slums, highway construction, urban transit and on the neglected space program."

In any case, says Ralph A. Rotnem, senior vice president of Harris Upham & Co., "which way the market moves depends on the direction of the war news." And of late, says Monte J. Gordon, senior vice president of Bache & Co., "the market has been nervous and skittish," with Vietnam "the overriding and pervasive factor."

Wall Street hasn't always viewed the war as it now does. In the summer of 1965, when President Johnson made the first major commitment of American combat troops to Vietnam, his move made investors feel anything but nervous and skittish; from a level of about 861 in late July 1965 the Dow-Jones industrials climbed steadily to the historic high of 995.15 on Feb. 9, 1966. Investors then saw big military outlays as spurring an economy that they thought was threatening to go sluggish. They not only greeted escalation of the fighting with vigorous buying but sold on rumors of peace talks.

A 14-MONTH LOW

Now the pattern is the exact opposite. The last time the market heard vague rumors that North Vietnam might be willing to talk peace, the Dow-Jones industrials spurted 7.78 points in a single day, Jan. 8, to their recent closing peak of 908.92. When those rumors proved unfounded, prices began to drop, and the break accelerated sharply when ferocious Vietcong attacks erupted in cities throughout South Vietnam. By Feb. 13, the average had plunged 77.15 points, or 8.48%, to a close of 831.77. A minor recovery followed, but it gave way to a new decline as soon as reports circulated that the Administration was considering committing more troops to Vietnam and calling up some reserves; yesterday the average closed at a 14-month low of 827.03.

The biggest reason for this escalation-is-bearish attitude unquestionably is investors' fear that a bloodier war will lead sooner or later to wage and price controls, which would put a damper on corporate profits.

Until recently, Washington officials usually had mentioned controls only in the course of denying that any were contemplated. But lately there have been vague hints that controls might be needed to combat inflationary pressures, at least if Congress continues to stall President Johnson's request for a 10% income-tax surcharge.

INFLATION WORRIES

The inflationary pressures, aggravated by war spending that increases the Government budget deficit, are in themselves another major market worry. "The wage-price spiral is already serious and is continuing to gain momentum," says Argus Research Corp. Last year average hourly compensation to U.S. manufacturing workers rose 6.1%, while the workers' output per man-hour inched up only 0.9%. Wall Street believes the result-

ing labor-cost pressure on manufacturers' profits has been only partially relieved by price boosts.

The war also adds to the drain of dollars out of the U.S., which both Wall Street and the White House see as reaching crisis proportions. In the fourth quarter, the balance-of-payments deficit hit a seasonally adjusted \$1.8 billion, the worst in any quarter since 1950.

With that big a deficit, says Argus Research, "there is no disguising the fact that the dollar is in a weaker position than at any time since World War II." And President Johnson's measures to stop the dollar drain, which include mandatory curbs on U.S. business investments overseas, appeared to some investors to foreshadow the kind of controls that war strains may cause to be clamped on the domestic economy.

Analysts and investors blame a variety of other problems largely on the war, too. In fact, "the market really doesn't have any problems now that aren't related to the war," says Robert T. Allen of Shearson Hammill & Co.

With the tax surcharge stalled, the Federal Reserve Board since November has been following a more restrictive credit policy to combat inflationary pressures. This policy seems now to be discouraging corporate borrowing to finance new plants and equipment. In 1967's fourth quarter, capital appropriations by the nation's 1,000 largest manufacturers slipped to \$5.7 billion, or 4% less than in the third quarter, says the National Industrial Conference Board.

Even a tendency by consumers to save an unusually high proportion of their incomes—7.5% in the fourth quarter, the highest figure in 14 years—is blamed on the war by most market analysts. They say consumers are unwilling to make new outlays when the possibility of a tax boost hangs over them, and young men in particular aren't anxious to make major purchases such as new cars while they face the draft.

BULLS ON PEACE

Peace, say many analysts, would eliminate or at least greatly ease all the market's fears. It "would cool down inflation significantly, ease the balance-of-payments problem, relax the monetary situation, remove the need for a tax increase and eliminate the threat of economic controls," says Richard E. Scruggs of Goodbody & Co. Mr. Allen of Shearson Hammill adds that "not only would the threat of a tax increase be removed, but before too long a tax reduction probably would be possible."

Analysts divide on whether peace would be bullish immediately, or only after an initial stock-price downturn. Mr. Scruggs, for one, thinks the "first flush" of peace might bring a short-lived price drop because of the uncertainty that arises whenever investors face "an entirely new ball game."

Even Mr. Grimm of Walston, perhaps Wall Street's leading bull on peace, cautions that "a peace that was based on a Communist success in Vietnam and encouraged them to start new drives in Laos and Thailand" wouldn't help the market much. And though investors have been treating rumors of peace negotiations as highly bullish, some analysts say the start of actual negotiations might not bring a lasting price upturn. They remember that the negotiations that eventually ended the Korean War dragged on for two years while intense fighting continued.

POSTWAR RECESSION A "MYTH"?

But analysts dismiss any thought that "genuine" peace in Vietnam would be followed by a postwar recession. That has been the traditional reason for the market to treat peace as bearish, and in the past it has not always been invalid. A recession did begin one month after the Korean War, and it continued for about a year.

But analysts say the world was different

then. "It's a myth that war has to be followed by a recession, particularly in this day of a Government-managed economy," says Mr. Scruggs of Goodbody. Postwar recessions traditionally are caused by drastic cutbacks in Government military spending. But analysts now expect the effects of such cutbacks on the economy to be offset either by the stepped-up Government spending for domestic needs that Mr. Grimm of Walston expects or by the tax reduction that Mr. Allen of Shearson Hammill looks forward to, or possibly by a combination of both.

Cutbacks in military spending, of course, would result in more than a brief setback for some industries. They "would hurt the defense industries and some of the electronics producers," says Newton D. Zinder of E. F. Hutton & Co., though he adds that "most basic industries would welcome peace."

Other analysts note that the defense industries already are out of favor with many investors—perhaps the strongest of all indications of Wall Street's antiwar mood. "Strange as it may seem, in view of the faster tempo of the war, there is a definite prejudice against stocks with a high national-defense emphasis," says Lucien O. Hooper of W. F. Hutton & Co.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, newspaper articles such as this demonstrate that there is increasing awareness in American society today that not only are our young men being sacrificed at an ever-increasing rate, but that the very Treasury of this Nation is in deep danger of being destroyed. The whole economic system of the United States is now in danger of collapsing as a result of a thing called the Vietnam war, a war about 10,000 miles away from home, in which there has been no definition of a noble purpose for which this country should be destroyed.

I should imagine, if one were in the Kremlin and could draw blueprints for action to destroy the United States, one could probably simply say, "Look, at what the United States is doing now," and add, "Nothing could do better to destroy the United States and to break the system they have developed, including the freedoms of the individual, the right of a person to worship as he pleases, say what he wants to live where he wishes, travel where he wants to"—nothing could accomplish the purposes of the Communists more readily than what is being done in Vietnam now.

Certainly, in a democracy, where we place a high value on human decency, where we have believed that reverence for life is the goal of humanity, this is a far cry from accomplishing those purposes. Here we have a war now costing us more than \$4 million an hour—more than \$4 million an hour—where we do not even listen to the wise words of the former President of the United States, President Eisenhower, when he said we should wage a war for peace, strengthen the United Nations, and go forward to meet other nations in the field of trying to help humanity. We have been moving in the opposite direction.

I hope that the Committee on Foreign Relations will insist that before we take another step, before we move further up this path toward the ultimate destruction of America itself, that the Senate will at least try to exercise the responsibility that is properly ours.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ap-

preciate the Senator saying the Committee on Foreign Relations should do this. However, it seems to me that it will have to be the Senate as a whole that does the insisting. Unless a large percentage of this body insists on exercising its responsibility, the insistence of the Committee on Foreign Relations will not get very far. We have insisted on a number of things, for a long time, and we have not had a very adequate response.

I am raising this subject on the floor instead of in the committee, because all 100 Senators share responsibility for the lives and fortunes of our people as much as the Committee on Foreign Relations. If the Members of this body are not willing to join in the request that we be informed and have an opportunity to debate the matter, it will not be done. It has not been done up to now, during this war.

We have, as I have already stated, a resolution which was brought here and given to the Committees on Foreign Relations and Armed Services with false statements as to the reasons for it. I accepted the administration's proposed resolutions. I brought it to the floor of the Senate, and submitted it to the Senate. It was passed almost unanimously, with only two dissenting votes.

That is the record, as far as authorization or approval of the war in Vietnam goes.

I am only saying that all Senators should have an interest in this matter, one way or the other. Even those who are 100 percent behind the war, it seems to me, should be in favor of our being informed and having a discussion about it, and in justifying it if they are behind it. That is the only point I am trying to make.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, replying on my time to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I ask those who are endorsing the policy of this administration, if it is productive of good results in their opinion, why should they fear having the American people, a self-governing society, have the right to have all of it explained in detail before the people? Certainly the people have the right to know.

I have read the record of the hearing before the Committee on Foreign Relations when Gen. Maxwell Taylor appeared. We had at that time about 35,000 to 37,000 troops in Vietnam, and they were then saying that they needed 75,000.

The question was asked General Taylor at that time:

Do you think there will ever be a time when we will need 175,000?

He said:

I do not want to be firm in my figures. I would agree that we might need a few more than 75,000, but we would never need 175,000.

I remember those people who used to talk about the need for a million. They said, "Never will we need a million." Today that is a thinkable figure, and only 2 years ago it was unthinkable.

I think if we had had this matter presented, as the Senator from Texas would like, in the context of everything that could be understood, the American people could have made a decent judgment, and would not now find themselves being

slowly bled to death. For just as a leach bleeds a person to death, this country is being bled of its treasure, its manpower, and its young people.

How are we going to answer those people? For what noble purposes are they dying? Are they fighting communism? Then why do we not fight it in Cuba? Why do we not answer the questions of General Hsiu? Why do we not have General Hsiu, this dedicated military man, appear before the American people and tell them what is going on? Why do we not answer the questions of General Gavin?

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HARTKE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. TOWER. Does the Senator advocate that we invade Cuba?

Mr. HARTKE. No. I ask this simple question: I ask the Senator from Texas, does he advocate destroying communism in Cuba?

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I should very much like to see us adopt some of the very successful methods used by the enemy. He follows a strategy not always of overt, but covert, aggression. He has established his infrastructures clandestinely in most of the underdeveloped countries of this world; and every time this clandestine infrastructure surfaces and starts a guerrilla war, there are too many people in this country who say it is just a little old domestic revolution.

Mr. President, it is no such thing. To answer the Senator's question—No, I think perhaps we have waited too long in Cuba. I think that by covert means we should support every effort on the part of those who resist the Castro regime in Cuba, and we should do everything we can to discourage Castroite rebellions in other parts of Latin America, which are always staged in Cuba. I think we should do that.

If we abandon Vietnam, then, of course, we abandon Laos as well, and Cambodia, and then Thailand. What are we going to do about Thailand? There is a Communist underground organization mounting terrorist attacks against the people in Thailand, and North Vietnamese guerrillas are deeply involved.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I refuse to yield further to the Senator from Texas on my time, I shall be glad to yield further on the Senator's time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas has the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I think it should be crystal clear that anyone who speaks on his own time, under the present parliamentary situation, time cannot be transferred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas has the floor.

Mr. HARTKE. Will the Senator from Arkansas continue to yield 1 more minute to me, on my own time?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. HARTKE. What about the imprisoned people in China? That is one-fourth of all the people in the world. Does the Senator from Texas advocate

going in and freeing those people? What are we going to do about them? They are as human as the people in Vietnam. We keep saying we are going to "free" the South Vietnamese; what about the people in China, a fourth of the people of the world?

Mr. TOWER. I shall be happy to respond, if the Senator will yield.

Mr. HARTKE. I will be happy to yield on the Senator's time. Otherwise, he can use my time; I do not care.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No, the Senator cannot transfer his time.

Mr. HARTKE. I will be happy to get an answer on anybody's time.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, speaking on my own time, it is too late for us to go in and liberate the masses of China. The Senator very well knows we cannot do it. It was our mistake which led to the enslavement of China. Instead of listening to the warnings of people like MacArthur and Chennault, we yielded to the arguments of those who said that the Chinese Communists were merely agrarian reformers, and we permitted China to fall. That is one of the mistakes that led to Vietnam, and I do not condone it.

The point is that once the Communist supporters have been defined, if we permit them to expand, or permit them to maintain more military adventures, it is likely to lead to world war III.

The late Adlai Stevenson defended our position in Southeast Asia. He said that we cannot allow them to continue opening door after door, until they lead to the final door that will result in the ultimate conflagration.

I reject the position that the Russians are going to start throwing thermonuclear charges at us. It simply does not make sense.

The Soviets may be an unpleasant people, but they are not foolish, and they are not going to destroy the Soviet Union as a viable society by initiating a thermonuclear war because of what we do in Southeast Asia.

Mr. HARTKE. If the Senator is correct, why would he have any objection to telling the people? We are a self-governing society. Why are not the American people entitled to know where we are going to end up, how many more troops we want to send, and whether we want to follow the advice of Admiral Burke, who said that we should invade the North?

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I would be glad to answer that question on my own time.

I do not favor the administration position always. I am sure that the distinguished Senator from Indiana has more influence with the administration than I do.

I am a member of the opposite party. I am not in favor with the Democratic Party. However, once they have adopted a basic policy by which we have committed American boys there, we are not going to serve the American interest by creating in the minds of the enemy a question that we are divided or are ready to throw in the towel and get out.

If we do create that impression, let us get out before we waste American lives. However, if we determine to stay, let us make sure to understand that determination.

I remember the cry of John Foster Dulles: Massive retaliation. We came back with the policy of flexible response. They want to abandon the policy of flexible response. Are we going to maintain a respectable deterrent? That means being able to respond with however much and whatever type of force is necessary. And that deterrent must be credible.

It would not be credible if we pulled out of Vietnam. The whole world would be saying, "The United States is a paper tiger. We can capture her ships on the high seas and attack her friends with impunity."

That is exactly what they are doing.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I say to my good friend, the Senator from Texas, that the Senator from Indiana probably is at the end of the line as to influence with the administration on its policy. I would think that, being a fellow Texan, the Senator from Texas would be much more influential with the administration than I would be.

If the Senator wants to defend the policies of the administration, why does he not want the administration to tell us what the policies are?

Perhaps I can find common ground with the Senator from Texas on the question of letting the people know what the next step will be. The Senator says that we should use the arsenal strength. I agree. However, military might does not establish our determination alone. American strength is in our ideals and our principles. This is the strength of America.

The typical America is not one who lords it over a fifth-rate nation, I would say that all America is in a state of shock at what happened recently. The situation has certainly been serious, and the death toll of 542 this past week is just one short of an all-time high—a shock to all America.

None of us can say anything to alleviate that death and suffering. No one can define any satisfactory explanation as to why 80 Americans must die every day in Vietnam. We must win the hearts of the people. We are not winning them, that I understand.

I thought General Gavin's statement to the Nation was excellent—that America is to be bewildered by the surprise that occurred during the recent raids of the major cities of South Vietnam. The thing that shocked him the most was how the Vietcong could come into the hearts of the cities without there having been a general betrayal by the countryside. It certainly demonstrates that there is something wrong in Saigon and in Vietnam.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I take this opportunity to commend the Senator from Arkansas. I know that the people of my State at least want very much to have the U.S. Congress fully discuss all aspects of the Vietnam war before any escalation takes place, before more Maryland boys, more American troops are sent into Vietnam.

I for one would like to know what the distinguished senior Senator from Geor-

gia [Mr. RUSSELL], the distinguished junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], the distinguished junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], and other Senators know about the proposed escalation of the war, whether they have been consulted, and what their views are.

Our forefathers who fought against colonial rule rejected the idea that one person could commit the young men of a nation to battle without the full and free consent of the people of that nation.

When our forefathers drafted our Constitution, they specified that the Senate of the United States would have certain responsibilities, and among those responsibilities was the provision that the Senate advise and consent in the conduct of foreign policy.

I can only say that I think it is high time that the Senate fully participate in the conduct of our policy in Vietnam, before new action is taken rather than afterward.

As I indicated, I would also like to hear the judgment of some of the senior Members of the Senate and have the facts before the Senate in advance of the event, rather than after the event.

I commend the distinguished Senator from Arkansas for his efforts in this matter.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the Senator has expressed exactly the main point in my remarks. I want to hear exactly the same thing. I am not trying to guess in advance what the judgment of this body or of the administration will be.

The Senator expressed exactly what I had in mind when I spoke earlier.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the Senator from Arkansas does not have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas does have the floor.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, how much time can the Senator yield? He has only 1 hour, and he has yielded 1 hour already.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, may I make a point of order. The Senator from Ohio is out of order.

Will the Presiding Officer ask him to sit down?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I do not yield for such purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas has the floor.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield on my time?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I join the other Senators in endorsing the suggestion of the Senator from Arkansas that we have a full-dress discussion on the floor of the Senator on the matter of Vietnam.

I am a little puzzled by some of the comments I hear on the floor concerning Vietnam. I remember so well before we committed any troops on the ground in Vietnam at all, and when the first commitment of troops on the ground was started those of us who stood on the floor and opposed the commitment of troops in Vietnam on the ground that it would involve us in a big war received a

lot of patronizing speeches and lectures from our good friends in the U.S. Senate and the press who wondered what we knew about military matters.

It was never said on the floor of the Senate, that I know of—not once by the proponents of this war—that, as a result of our ground commitment in Vietnam, 3 years hence we would have over a half million men in Vietnam. That was never said by any of those who supported escalation.

Those of us who opposed this policy of committing ground troops were ridiculed for our lack of understanding of the situation.

I remember standing here and having one of our distinguished colleagues say, "And what do you know about military policy that makes you so much wiser than our military experts that you can say this will be a big war?"

The fact of the matter is that the instinct of those of us who oppose this policy was far better than the military expertise of those who told us we ought to get involved there.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY] and I criticized the escalation in comments on the floor of the Senate in October of 1965. At that time we had only some 80,000 troops there. We were then invited to confer with Gen. Maxwell Taylor about Vietnam. General Taylor is a very distinguished gentleman and a highly regarded military expert.

In the course of that conversation—and I just point out this story to indicate the lack of understanding on the part of the military experts on the nature and character of the revolution in Vietnam—I said to Mr. Taylor:

Yes, but they are infiltrating at the rate of 1,500 troops a month right now, and under the Malaysian theory of ten-to-one, that requires us to match them with 15,000 troops per month—our own troops.

I finished with this question:

I suppose that we are more militarily sophisticated than the British were at the time of Malaysia, with better transportation, helicopters, and all the rest, so that maybe it would only take five-to-one. Is that correct?

General Taylor said:

Yes, the mathematics is correct. But you are wrong on your assumption that it would take 7,500 to match 1,500, because they are over-extended in the South now and logistically they cannot support the troops they have there at present.

And within 7, 8, or 9 months they were sending 7,000 a month into South Vietnam and supporting them very well.

The point I make is that the military made a colossal misjudgment; and this country and most of the editorial writers and most of the Senate and most of the House believed the military when they said it would take 75,000 troops, or something like that, to bring Ho Chi Minh to the bargaining table. I did not believe it, Senator McGOVERN and Senator McCARTHY did not believe it, the Senator from Arkansas did not believe it, and a handful of other Senators did not believe it. We happen to have been correct on that matter.

I regret very much to have to dig up this history, but it is relevant, because we are now at the 500,000-troop stage.

I delivered a speech in February of 1966 in which I said that even if we send in a million men and suppress the military insurgency, when we leave that country in devastation, the Communists will take it over, and I think there is little doubt about that. It is not going to take 600,000 troops or 700,000 troops to win a military victory there. We will have a tough time doing it if we send 2 million American boys there. That is how tough that revolutionary war is. Ho Chi Minh has 450,000 uncommitted troops in the North. When we send in 100,000, they can send 20,000 more down south and, in a guerrilla war, tie down 100,000 of our troops.

The question is, Do you want to go up to 1.5 million or 2 million men? That is the question. Or do you want to do everything possible to negotiate, deescalate, get some international supervision in there, and cool this situation down? The choice is that. When you have finished putting in 1.5 million or 2 million men, you may militarily suppress the guerrillas. You will not wipe them out. They do not have to fight when they do not want to fight. You suppress the insurgency and you sit there with 2 million men. And when you leave, they are back again.

So to what avail are we pouring in troops and troops and killing and killing in that country, in a place where you cannot have a conventional military victory? I believe it is a tragic situation; and I say that we are worse off now, with 500,000 troops there, than when we did not have any troops on the ground there at all. And we would be worse off with 700,000 or 1 million troops there than we are now.

I should like to make a comment with respect to the Gulf of Tonkin resolution. I do not know what testimony was given before the Senator's committee—only what I read in the newspapers. Some day I shall read that testimony. However, I do not base my objection to the interpretation of the Gulf of Tonkin resolution on the ground that we were misled by the attacks there. I object to the interpretation put upon the Gulf of Tonkin resolution, that it was a vote by the Senate, with only two dissenting votes, to authorize an open-ended expansion of this war, because that is not true.

If the Senator from Arkansas had stood on the floor of the Senate, in the middle of that debate in 1964—August 6, 7, and 8—and had said that the resolution authorizes a ground commitment of an unlimited number of troops and changes our mission in South Vietnam, he would have been defeated on that resolution in the Senate. He would have been defeated by 80 percent of the votes in the Senate.

Let me read something about what that resolution said.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator does not yield for that purpose.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is this a question to the Senator from Arkansas, or is it a speech that is beyond the rules?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point is well taken. The Senator from Arkansas has the floor and can yield for a question.

Mr. TOWER. Regular order, Mr. President.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. We are under limited time. Each Senator has 1 hour.

Mr. NELSON. I am not surprised that the Senator does not want to hear this.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The regular order has been asked for. The Senator from Arkansas can yield only for a question.

Mr. NELSON. My question is, Why does the Senator from Arkansas suppose that the other Senators do not want to hear this colloquy?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. They object to the substance of it.

I will say, on my own time—and I can yield to the Senator for a question—that the Senator from Wisconsin spoke a moment ago about intuition; and I am bound to say that I believe that is the proper word. He did have the intuition at the time the resolution was brought to the Senate to question it, and I believe he presented the most penetrating questions of any Member of this body.

I can only say that I responded then to those questions in accordance with what I had been told by the administration. I knew nothing firsthand about what had occurred in the Gulf of Tonkin 2 nights before.

I believe the Senator is speaking of a debate on August 7, 1964. Of course, I was relying upon the truthfulness of the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs. At that time I was not very experienced in dealing with these gentlemen, and I believed everything they told us—not only with respect to the facts but also as to their interpretation of their policy.

I also believed the President of the United States when he said that his purpose was not to fight a war in Asia with American boys. I have his exact statement in my notes.

The Senator from Wisconsin raised questions about whether the resolution went too far, and, in my innocence, I assured him that the last thing the administration intended was a land war on the mainland of Asia. I believe the Senator will find that in the 1964 RECORD, in so many words. I said I was assured that this was not the purpose of the resolution; that its sole purpose, the main purpose, of the resolution was to prevent a war, to prevent any expansion of hostilities.

In fact, I was persuaded that the purpose of the resolution was to show the unity of this body, and that this would deter the North Vietnamese from any further attacks. That was the entire theory. I repeated it on the floor of the Senate. The RECORD will show it.

I talked the Senator from Wisconsin out of an amendment which he wanted to offer. I did not object to it on its merits, but because I had been persuaded by the administration that any delay, even to accept an amendment in consonance with the meaning of the resolution, would destroy its effect and would mean unnecessary delay.

I am glad the Senator has brought the subject up. He deserves great credit for his intuition, and I hope his intuition is even now as healthy and as reliable as it was then.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question.

Mr. NELSON. The point I am trying to make clear is that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations was speaking for the administration on the Gulf of Tonkin resolution. Is that not correct?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I was; that is correct. I was their spokesman. They coached me as to what had happened.

Mr. NELSON. And as to what the intent of the resolution was?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. And what the intent was.

Mr. NELSON. When I offered the amendment because I thought it might be subject to misinterpretation, and to tighten it up so that it did not authorize an expansion of our 10-year mission of technical aid and assistance, the Senator from Arkansas assured me, did he not, that it was his interpretation of the resolution that it did not expand the authorization?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I was assured that that was the administration's intention. I did not propose that resolution, I did not write it, and I was not its sponsor, as I have been accused of being in some quarters. I was simply bringing it as the chairman of the committee.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. NELSON. I should like to read to the Senator a portion of my remarks and a portion of his.

After addressing myself to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations at that time, I pointed out that our mission in South Vietnam had been one of technical aid and assistance for 10 years. Then I said:

But I am concerned about the Congress appearing to tell the executive branch and the public that we would endorse a complete change in our mission. That would concern me.

Mr. FULBRIGHT, responding, on August 7, 1964, said:

I do not interpret the joint resolution in that way at all. It strikes me, as I understand it, that the joint resolution is quite consistent with our existing mission and our understanding of what we have been doing in South Vietnam for the last 10 years.

Is it not correct that what we have been doing was simply giving technical aid, assistance, and cadre training?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes; and we had only advisers there.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement I made in connection with the Tonkin Gulf resolution on September 18, 1967.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR NELSON ON VIETNAM

In recent weeks there have been renewed and vigorous discussions about the meaning and intent of the Tonkin Bay Resolution. It has lately been repeatedly asserted by Administration spokesmen, writers and others that the overwhelming vote for the resolution in 1964 expressed Congressional approval of whatever future military action the Administration deemed necessary to thwart aggression in Vietnam including a total change

in the character of our mission there from one of technical aid and assistance to a full scale ground war with our troops.

This, of course, is pure nonsense. If such a proposition had been put to the Senate in August, 1964, a substantial number of Senators, if not a majority, would have opposed the resolution. What we are now witnessing is a frantic attempt by the Hawks to spread the blame and responsibility for Vietnam on a broader base. They should not be allowed to get away with it. It is not accurate history and it is not healthy for the political system. The future welfare of our country depends upon an understanding of how and why we got involved in a war that does not serve our national self interest. If we don't understand the mistakes that got us into this one we won't be able to avoid blundering into the next.

The intent and meaning of any proposition before the Congress is determined by the plain language of the act itself, the interpretation of that language by the official spokesman for the measure and the context of the times in which it is considered.

Because of my concern about the broad implications of some of the language I offered a clarifying amendment. The official Administration spokesman for the resolution, Mr. Fulbright, said the amendment was unnecessary because the intent of the resolution was really the same as my more specific amendment. In short, according to Mr. Fulbright, the resolution did not intend to authorize a fundamental change in our role in Vietnam.

Three Presidents had made it clear what that limited role was, and this resolution did not aim or claim to change it.

If the official Administration spokesman for a measure on the floor is to be subsequently repudiated at the convenience of the Administration, why bother about such matters as "legislative intent?" In fact, why bother about Administration spokesmen at all? At the conclusion of these remarks I will reprint from the Congressional Record my colloquy with Mr. Fulbright which formed the basis for my vote on the Tonkin Bay Resolution. Had he told me that the resolution meant what the Administration now claims it means I would have opposed it and so would have Mr. Fulbright.

However, an even more important factor in determining the intent of that resolution is the political context of the times when it was considered by the Congress. It was before the Senate for consideration on August 6 and 7, 1964. We were in the middle of a Presidential campaign. Goldwater was under heavy attack for his advocacy of escalation. The Administration clearly and repeatedly insisted during that period that we should not fight a ground war with our troops. No one in the Administration was suggesting any change in our very limited participation in the Vietnam affair.

The whole mood of the country was against Goldwater and escalation and particularly against the idea that "American boys" should fight a war that "Asian boys" should fight for themselves, as the President put it in September of that year.

For the Administration now to say that the Tonkin Resolution considered during this period had as part of its purpose the intent to secure Congressional approval for fundamentally altering our role in Vietnam to our present ground war commitment is political nonsense if not in fact pure hypocrisy.

If Mr. Fulbright, speaking for the Administration, had in fact asserted that this was one of the objectives of the resolution the Administration would have repudiated him out of hand. They would have told him and the Congress this resolution had nothing to do with the idea of changing our long estab-

lished role in Vietnam. They would have told Congress as they were then telling the country that we oppose Goldwater's irresponsible proposals for bombing the North and we oppose getting involved in a land war there with our troops. That was the Administration position when the Tonkin Resolution was before us. They can't change it now. It is rather ironic now to see how many otherwise responsible and thoughtful people have been "taken in" by the line that Congress did in fact by its Tonkin vote authorize this whole vast involvement in Vietnam. The fact is neither Congress nor the Administration thought that was the meaning of Tonkin—and both would have denied it if the issue had been raised.

The current intensity of the discussion over the military status of Vietnam, the Tonkin Resolution and the elections signal a new phase of the war dialogue. What's really new in the dialogue now is the sudden, almost universal recognition by a majority of the Hawks that this is after all a much bigger war than they had bargained for.

They now realize for the first time that to win a conventional military victory will require a much more massive commitment of men and material than they ever dreamed would be necessary. How many men? A million at least and perhaps two million without any assurance that a clear cut military victory would result in any event. Furthermore, it has finally dawned on the Hawks that a military victory does not assure a political victory—in fact there is no connection between the two and one without the other is of no value whatsoever.

This new recognition of the tough realities of Vietnam afford the opportunity for a reappraisal of our situation in Vietnam and a redirection of our efforts.

The danger we now face is the mounting pressure from military and political sources for a substantial escalation of the bombing attack in the North. The fact is the whole military-political power establishment (both Republican and Democratic) has been caught in a colossal miscalculation. They have been caught and exposed in the very brief period of 24 months since we foolishly undertook a land war commitment.

They did not then nor do they now understand the nature, character and vigor of the political revolution in Vietnam. But in order to save face they are now demanding an expansion of the war. If they prevail we will then see another fruitless expansion which will not bring the war to a conclusion but will extend our risk of a confrontation with China.

Unfortunately the Administration continues its policy of so called controlled expansion of pressure on the North which really is nothing more nor less than endless escalation which will likely lead to a vast expansion of the war. It ought to be understood once and for all that no amount of pressure on the North will settle the war in the South. A complete incineration of the North will not end the capacity of the guerrilla to continue to fight in the South.

Though we committed a grave blunder in putting ground troops into Vietnam in the first place, it does not make sense to compound the blunder by pouring in additional troops. The Administration proposal for 45,000 additional troops with tens of thousands more demanded by the military is simply a blind and foolish move in the wrong direction.

What the military really needs is a million or two million ground troops for the war they want to fight. Furthermore, no one can explain what possible proportional benefit this country or the free world will get for this kind of massive allocation of resources—even assuming this would win the military-political war which I think is highly doubtful.

There is no easy solution to our involve-

ment, but now, before it is too late, is the time to decide what direction from here we are going to go in Vietnam.

There is, it seems to me, only one sensible direction to go and that is toward de-escalation and negotiations.

It was a mistake for us to Americanize this war in the first place, and it is an even greater mistake to continue it as an American war. As soon as the elections are over this Sunday we should cease bombing the North in order to afford the opportunity to explore the possibility of negotiations. It is rather ironic that Chief of State Thieu, the military candidate for President, favors a bombing pause but our military oppose it. Whose war is this?

Next we should fundamentally alter our military and political policies in the South. We should notify the South that henceforth it will be the job of South Vietnamese to do the chore of political and military pacification of the South. While our troops occupy the population centers, furnish the supplies, transportation and air cover, it must be the job of the Vietnamese to win the political and military war in the South. If they do not have the morale, the interest, the determination to win under these circumstances then their cause can't be won at all.

Surely it ought to be understood by now that if there is going to be a meaningful solution to the Vietnam problem they must be the ones who make it meaningful.

Furthermore, if it is true, as our State Department says, that all other South East Asian countries feel they have a stake in Vietnam, let them send some troops of their own to prove their interest.

Under this approach we will reduce the loss of our troops to a minimum and we will find out whether our allies in the South really believe they have something to fight for. If they do, they have the chance to build their own country. If they don't, then we should get out.

This seems to me is our best alternative to the fruitless policy of endless escalation.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, it is my understanding that since time cannot be transferred, whenever I yield the time is taken out of the other Senator's time. I notice from the Parliamentarian that he seems to indicate that is not so. What is the situation with regard to the allocation of time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts in the chair). The time cannot be transferred or yielded. However, if a question is addressed to the Senator holding the floor, unless he indicates that he is yielding on the other person's time, that time will be charged against the Senator who has the floor.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I did yield on the other person's time. If I neglected to do so I am not aware of it. I thought that had been the custom, but I have noticed during the past several days that has not always been the practice.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield the floor for a point of order?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No. I wish to yield to the Senator from Alaska on his time.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield I wish to make a point of order on his contention.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I make the point of order that it is this Senator's recollection that the Senator from Arkansas addressed at one point a request to the Chair if he yielded to anyone it would be taken from the time of the Senator who asked him to yield. The occupant of the chair nodded his head and indicated that that was so. It would not be fair now to take the time from the time of the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, that is what I understood. Now, the clerk indicates that is not so. I am going through the formality.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is only the question of the last 4 minutes that is involved.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. How much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 39 minutes remaining.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me on my time?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator from Alaska on his time.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will be in order.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question with respect to the parliamentary situation?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. On the Senator's time, I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes, in all fairness it is on my time.

I am not trying to stop the proceedings but I wish to inquire whether we are operating under the cloture rule; and is it not the rule of the Senate that a Senator can only yield for a question, and if it gets beyond that point anyone can call for the regular order and that stops the question. Is that not the rule?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is ordinarily the rule but it is not the practice being followed in debate on the floor. I have observed that for several days.

Mr. STENNIS. My only point is that the Senator is holding the floor and he yields to whomever he pleases. Apparently unless they agree with his sentiments he refuses to yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is quite incorrect. I said to the Senator from Ohio a long time ago that I would yield to him on his time but he refused to use his time. That was the only point.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a parliamentary question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No, but I yield on the Senator's time, as I yielded to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me to make a point of order?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yielded to the Senator from Texas on his time. I am not discriminating.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me to make a point of order?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator on his time.

Mr. STENNIS. I make the point of order that regardless of who is charged with time, the rules of the Senate still apply and the Senator can yield only for a question.

When a point of order is raised on this question, it is the duty of the Chair to rule on it; and if it is not abided by, then it is the duty of the Chair to ask the Senator and under the rule the Senator loses the floor.

That is the only rule I have ever heard applied here over the years. I respectfully raise that point of order.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. May I be heard on the point of order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is quite correct.

When a Senator calls for the regular order, as was done by the Senator from Texas, the rule was applied.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. After I have finished this.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that under the practices of the Senate he does not take the initiative to call Senators to order on that basis. When the request is made of the Chair by a Member of the Senate it will be entertained, but the Chair does not, of its own initiative, call Members of this body to order.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, and with great respect to the Senator from Arkansas, I raise the question again that he cannot yield except for a question, and ask the Chair to enforce the rule.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is quite at liberty to raise it each time. The only effect of the objection of the Senator from Mississippi is to force artificial phrasing of each assertion. Any assertion can be put in the form of a question. I know the practice that has been followed in the last 3 days of debate, since we are all under a time limitation of 1 hour, that the yielding has been not in the form of questions and nobody has raised a question.

If the Senator from Mississippi wishes to do so, he is at liberty to ask for the regular order. I want to make clear that there is not the slightest hesitation on my part to yield to any Senator who is a member of the Committee on Armed Services, and he can take all the time he has left, if he wishes.

The purpose of my speaking today was to encourage such important and influential Members of this body as the Senator from Mississippi to give us the benefit of his knowledge and views on this subject. That was the purpose. It need not necessarily be done today. That is not expected. But in due time, assuming the Senate has sufficient interest in the war in Vietnam, I hope they would like to debate it. Certainly I would like to have debate on our next step, and I believe that the Committee on Foreign Relations would like to have debate on it. That is my only purpose.

I hope the Senator from Mississippi will be willing to join in debate on the real principles and justification for the war in Vietnam.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I will yield to him on his time. I offered to do that a moment ago.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the regular order is called for, and it has been called for—

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I will—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has to do the recognizing.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senators may not yield time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. This has been very informal. I ask unanimous consent to be able to yield to the Senator from Ohio without losing my right to the floor, on his time.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, if the rule is to be strictly enforced, the Senator from Arkansas—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. This is to advise the Senator that this is on his time now.

Mr. GORE. I have 60 minutes.

Reserving the right to object, if the rules are to be strictly enforced, as the distinguished Senator from Mississippi insists upon, then the junior Senator from Arkansas lost the floor when he yielded to the Senator from Mississippi for a point of order. That can be done only by unanimous consent if the rule is rigidly and strictly enforced.

I hope we will not be reduced to this kind of debate in the Senate.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I understood I asked unanimous consent for my request.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I made a unanimous-consent request to yield without losing my right to the floor, or any other rights to a Senator during this debate, to the Senator from Ohio in order that he might propound whatever he wishes to propound on his time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, there is a point involved here.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. If we are going to abide by the rules of the Senate, I think we should let one Senator get the floor.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President—

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the cloture rule, each Senator has 1 hour, and the time is charged to the Senator recognized even for a reservation.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the time of the Senator from Arkansas is now running.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who is yielding time?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, not I. I yield no time but—

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—on my own time—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On the Senator's own time? The Senator from New Hampshire is recognized.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I did not attempt to participate in this exchange. As a matter of fact, I have great sympathy with the point raised by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas. I think that he is entitled to much credit for raising it and, at the proper time, I should like to say something about it, which would certainly be most favorable and complimentary to him.

But, Mr. President, the point is, the Senate adopted cloture. Therefore, each Senator has 1 hour in which to speak.

Under the rules, I think that we are entitled to have a ruling. Never mind the matter of the interruption being in the form of a question or a statement. If each one of the 100 Senators has 1 hour in which to speak, is it not a fact that the Chair and the Chair alone recognizes Senators to use their time and that a Senator who gets the floor after cloture has been invoked, and proceeds to say "I yield to so and so on his time," or "I yield to Senator so and so on his time," or "I yield on someone else's time," is holding the floor illegally against the rules of the Senate because cloture has been invoked?

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. With the indulgence of Senators, the Chair will consult the Parliamentarian for a moment.

Mr. GORE. On his own time, I hope. [Laughter.]

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire has propounded an inquiry for the Chair as to the use of time under cloture. Each Senator has 1 hour. He may not yield that time to anyone else. He may yield for a question. If, having the floor, he wants to yield to a Senator, on that Senator's own time, and there is no opposition, or no Senator calls for the regular order, then the Chair will tolerate that procedure, as long as that time is charged to the Senator to whom yielded, for a comment or inquiry. If the regular order is called for, the Senator who has been recognized can yield only for a question, except by unanimous consent.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, my question is being acted on and ruled on by the Chair, on my time. May I make this further inquiry?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire may do so.

Mr. COTTON. In other words, if a Senator gets the floor, he can proceed to take the place of the Chair and designate what Senators shall be allowed to speak on their time without having the time running against him?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If no one makes a point of order or calls the Senate to order, there is no reason why the Chair should object.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I made a unanimous request to yield to the

Senator from Ohio on his own time. Will the Chair please rule?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous request of the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. LAUSCHE. What is the request?

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I reserve my right to make a statement—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield for that purpose?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield for that purpose.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, a point of order. He does not have the right to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is out of order. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. LAUSCHE. He yielded time to the Senator from Mississippi and I raise the point of order—

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Mississippi wishes to clarify his previous statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas has made a unanimous-consent request that he be permitted to yield on the Senator's time.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President—

Mr. GORE. Regular order, Mr. President.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I object. [Laughter.]

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, may we have order in the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. The Senate is not in order. The Senate will be in order. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] has the floor and can yield only for a question.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the matter we are discussing here is a most important one. This diversion of levity is not promoting what I wanted to say. I did not wish to occupy the floor all afternoon. I wanted to give opportunities to Senators for short expressions of their views on the most serious, dangerous, and ominous matter which has faced this country in the past 100 years.

The Senator from Mississippi has just stated that in asking unanimous consent to yield to the Senator from Ohio I was following the rules and he is quite satisfied with that. I was asking unanimous consent in order to yield to the Senator from Ohio. The Senator from Ohio objects. Thus, I do not know how to deal with that kind of situation.

I wish to proceed with discussion of this matter which we were discussing—consideration of the rumor, and I think the generally admitted prospects of a substantial enlargement of the war in Vietnam, one way or another, in manpower, and in expansion geographically.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield for a question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I should like the opportunity to yield and ask unanimous consent to yield to those who are interested in speaking on this matter. I have only a few notes, and I can conclude my

remarks in a few minutes, but to those who wish to speak relevant to this question, I ask unanimous consent to yield without losing my right to the floor—

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I object. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, may I yield for a parliamentary inquiry without losing my right to the floor, with the understanding that I do not lose my right to the floor because I have a few more remarks I wish to make on this subject. Let me say that during the past few days, on debate on this matter, there has been very general yielding without unanimous consent. If this opposition is simply evidence of the unwillingness of Senators to discuss the Vietnam war, that is very significant of itself.

Why people have raised these arbitrary objections to this particular aspect of the debate, I suppose each will have to answer for himself. I do not see anything out of order or unusual about proposing to the Senate that it be concerned with the most dangerous issue before the country, and, as a matter of fact, before the world, today.

Now, Mr. President—

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair rules that the Senator from Arkansas can yield, without asking unanimous consent, for a question.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. On his time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On the time of the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President—

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Not on my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A Senator can yield any of his time out.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, on my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A Senator cannot ask unanimous consent to do that.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 30 seconds.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield, on my time, for 30 seconds, for a question.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator has been talking about this for an hour and a half, and I think the Senate is entitled to know the source of the rumor.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The rumor about the troops?

Mr. MONRONEY. The rumor. The Senator is talking about our having to send 100,000 or 200,000.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I did not say it was exactly 200,000.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am asking for the source of the rumor.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Well, I am the source of the rumor. [Laughter.]

As one Member of the Senate, I do not believe the Senator from Oklahoma is unaware of the fact that people do talk to Members of the Senate about such matters and there are a great many people in this Government who are concerned about this country's security. It is no secret that General Wheeler, who the Senator knows is the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the most influential person, I suppose, in the Gov-

ernment, outside of the President, has recently been to Vietnam and has recently returned, conveying the request of General Westmoreland. The Senator knows who General Westmoreland is. The Senator is, I think, aware of what happened in Vietnam last month. There were certain attacks and great victories that we achieved in Saigon and various cities like Hue. At least, that is the way the Senator from Texas interprets them—something of that sort.

I cannot guarantee the Senator that they are going to ask for 200,000, 201,000, 206,000, or 250,000. I do know, I think on the best authority, that consideration is today being given to the request brought back from General Westmoreland and his people by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff for more men.

If the Senator thinks this is a secret or only a rumor and there is no substance to it, I do not think he has read the papers or talked to anybody in the higher echelons of Government in recent days.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not yield, except on the Senator's own time, or for a question, but they will not allow me to do it.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am still waiting for an answer to the question as to what is the source of the rumor. The Senator has been generalizing. I wish he would answer the question. He has taken one and a half hours to tell us about this—

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If the Senator does not wish to listen to my remarks, he does not have to. There is no rule compelling him to listen.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator must speak on his own time.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I have not used my 1 hour. Can I not say what I have to say?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Not until the Senator is recognized.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not know why there is such an antagonistic attitude toward discussion of this subject. It strikes me as most unusual for Members of the Senate to be unwilling to have the Senate itself, which, under the Constitution, does have a specific responsibility for war, discuss a matter of this kind.

I thought the discussion, up to the intervention by the Senator from Mississippi, was proceeding in a most orderly manner. I did not think anyone was out of order. But there are more ways than one to disrupt a discussion, of course. I think those who are interested in the other matter should be prepared also to follow the same rules, and they have not been followed in the course of the debate in the last 3 days, to my own knowledge, not by rumor. I was here and I watched them yield under the same circumstances that I was willing to yield to other Members of the Senate. So evidently it is a subject matter offensive to some Members, rather than the procedure being offensive. If that is not so, I do not know why it is not discussed in the usual manner.

I regret I am unable to yield to the Senator from Alaska. I have a few more remarks, and then I shall yield the floor,

and the Senator from Alaska, or anyone else, can then take the floor.

Mr. GRUENING. I will get the floor in my own right.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, there are a few more remarks I wish to make to emphasize the role of the Senate—the role of the Congress, I should say. It is the Senate, of course, that we are particularly interested in.

There is considerable confusion about this war. The President has said—Mr. President, may we have order? I think Senators who are not interested in this subject can at least be quiet until I finish my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Order in the Senate.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the President said in his press conference of August 18, 1967, that he had full authority to go to war in Vietnam even without the Tonkin resolution; and Mr. Katzenbach, Under Secretary of State, told the Foreign Relations Committee last summer that declarations of war are "outmoded in the international arena." That is a quotation from his testimony before the committee.

The Constitution, on the other hand, did not vest the war power in the Executive; nor, indeed, did it divide the war power between Congress and the Executive. Rather, it vested the war power exclusively in Congress.

It was with these considerations in mind that the Foreign Relations Committee unanimously reported Senate Resolution 187, calling on the Executive hereafter not to initiate foreign wars without the consent of Congress.

So this is a matter that is central to this whole debate.

There is a subject here that, I think, bears very much on the point made by the Senator from Texas. On March 6, 1968, there appeared one of the most penetrating articles I have read on the subject—although I have read other similar articles—by Mr. Stanley Karnow, who is one of the leading correspondents of the Washington Post Foreign Service. As I said in the beginning, the Washington Post has had some second thoughts on this war. They have supported the war, I think, as firmly as any newspaper in the country, until recently. Mr. Karnow was in Hong Kong. I shall not read all the article at this time, but I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAOISTS HOPE FOR A LONG VIET WAR

(By Stanley Karnow)

HONG KONG—In Peking a few years ago, Mao Tse-tung received a Japanese guest who, in a penitent mood, apologized for Japan's invasion of China in the 1930s. To the guest's surprise, Mao waved away the apology. "By occupying half of China," Mao explained, "Japan incited the Chinese population to rise and fight aggression. Thus our army gained a million more men, and our movement gained a hundred million more followers."

"So instead of your apologizing to me, perhaps I should thank you."

That anecdote, recounted by Mao himself to European visitors recently was

obliquely designed to underline the aged Communist leader's conviction that the American presence in Vietnam, like Japan's thrust into China, will eventually strengthen the Communists while eroding United States prestige in Asia and the world.

SEE PROFIT IN WAR

As it is now going, moreover, Mao and his associates in Peking appear to view the Vietnam war as a chance for China to score significant political profit from only minimal risks.

While Washington often asserts that its Vietnam stand is blocking Chinese expansion, several analysts here submit that U.S. policy may be inadvertently accommodating Peking. Or, as one American observer here put it: "We seem to be playing the script the way Mao wrote it."

Just as China's vast human sea drowned the Japanese, Vietnam and Mao's estimation is a swamp that will increasingly bog down the United States, sapping its resources, discrediting its power pretensions, alienating its allies, fraying its ties with the Soviet Union, and aggravating dissension among Americans at home.

FOR PROLONGED FIGHTING

And just as he considers revolutionary war an "antitoxin" that "purges us of our own filth," Mao also sees a prolonged U.S. drive in Vietnam prompting growing numbers of Vietnamese to turn to the Communists, as China did in the lengthy conflict against Japan.

Mao believes, therefore, that the longer the war, the more likely a U.S. defeat. In his view as well, a long war would communize all Vietnamese but leave them too exhausted to resist Peking's domination despite their centuries-old anathema to Chinese hegemony.

Though Hanoi and the Vietcong are struggling for their own national aims, Mao evidently regards them as a surrogate force through which China is fighting the United States without confronting American muscle directly.

His strategy, consequently, is to avoid a clash with the United States, while exhorting Vietnamese Communists to continue waging a protracted "peoples war" regardless of cost.

Mao's willingness to fight to the last Vietnamese was reflected in December in his personal message to Nguyen Huu Tho, urging the Vietcong leader not to be daunted by "all kinds of difficulties." The message exclaimed: "Perseverance means victory."

At the same time, Mao's prudence was mirrored in another message from his adjutant, Lin Biao, to Hanoi's Defense Minister Vo Nguyen Giap, cautiously saying that Peking is "watching" Vietnam and would take action that "corresponds to the highest interests of the Chinese and Vietnamese peoples."

Within recent weeks, Peking has also welcomed the signs of war spreading into Cambodia and Laos, apparently in hopes of seeing the United States challenged by a broader battlefield. A recent Peoples Daily editorial hailed these new trouble spots under the title: "Heartening developments in Indochina."

WHAT PEKING FEARS

The two most acute threats to Peking's brinkmanship are the possibility of peace in Vietnam or, in contrast, a U.S. escalation northward that would propel the Chinese into a head-on collision against the United States.

The Chinese openly oppose a Vietnam settlement. Besides blasting American, Soviet and other peace feelers as "frauds," they have even criticized Hanoi for such maneuvers as appealing to Pope Paul VI, or offering to trade talks for a halt to U.S. bombings.

Most analysts here doubt that Peking would

overtly prevent Hanoi from making peace. On at least two past occasions, however, Mao thwarted tentative steps that could conceivably have led to negotiations.

In early 1965, at the leftist "Indochinese Peoples Conference" in Phnom Penh, Cambodia, Chinese lobbyists persuaded Hanoi's delegates to decline a mediation offer by Prince Norodom Sihanok, the Cambodian Chief of State.

A year later, Japanese Communist Party Secretary General Kenji Miyamoto visited Hanoi and Peking, evidently under Russian auspices, to devise a Sino-Soviet "united action" program, designed mainly to discourage further U.S. commitments to Vietnam.

Miyamoto won the support of Premier Chou En-lai and other Chinese leaders. But Mao rejected the joint program, partly because he suspected Moscow might use it as a lever for negotiations, mostly because he considers "peoples war" the only valid strategy. He bluntly told Miyamoto: "Don't fear war; don't fear isolation."

RED COLLAPSE IN INDONESIA

Mao's impatience with shortcut tactics was especially sharp at that time. Only a few months earlier, on Oct. 1, 1965, the huge Indonesian Communist Party had collapsed as it tried to pull a coup d'etat in Jakarta.

The Indonesian Communist failure served to reinforce Mao's conviction that Hanoi and the Vietcong could succeed only through prolonged "people's war." It also bulwarked Mao's faith in protracted war as China's defense.

As U.S. strength in Vietnam built up in late 1965, Mao reminded the Vietcong that "people's war" signified self-reliance rather than Peking's potential intervention. Since then, his Cultural Revolution has apparently made China's military involvement in Vietnam more improbable.

With its Communist Party decimated, China's army is the sole apparatus available to impose a semblance of order in the cities. Even so, troops are finding it hard to tame the unruly Red Guards and other activists who refuse to abandon their dreams of permanent rebellion.

ARMY NOW A PROBLEM

Moreover, Mao's purges ravaged China's upper military echelons so brutally that the army's dependability for a foreign venture may be questionable.

The senior officers dismissed or disgraced in the past two years include the Chief-of-Staff, Lo Jui-Ching, four of his deputies, seven top political commissars, the artillery and armored corps chiefs, and 13 of the 23 military district commanders.

Experts here believe that only the naked threat of a U.S. attack on China would induce Peking to send a substantial force into Vietnam. From Peking's angle, it is thought, such a threat might be nothing less than the destruction of Hanoi's army in a U.S. invasion of North Vietnam.

Meanwhile, the Chinese are reportedly accelerating their military and economic aid shipments to Hanoi, repairing North Vietnam's railroads, providing sanctuary in South China for North Vietnamese aircraft, and concentrating on improving the same defensive strategy they employed against the Japanese a generation ago.

And while American troops in South Vietnam are battling to preserve the Saigon government, Peking's leaders seem confident amid China's internal turmoil that the Vietnamese Communists are wearing down the United States for their benefit.

Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. President, the thesis of this article is that the United States, in its innocence, is playing the Communist game. In other words, we are doing, as I believe the Senator from New York stated, ourselves injury such

as no Communist country could possibly do short of an all-out nuclear war.

I want to read one or two paragraphs from the article. He said:

In Peking a few years ago, Mao Tse-tung received a Japanese guest who, in a penitential mood, apologized for Japan's invasion of China in the 1930s. To the guest's surprise, Mao waved away the apology. "By occupying half of China," Mao explained, Japan incited the Chinese population to rise and fight aggression." Thus our army gained a million more men, and our movement gained a hundred million more followers.

I read further:

While Washington often asserts that its Vietnam stand is blocking Chinese expansion, several analysts here submit that U.S. policy may be inadvertently accommodating Peking. Or, as one American observer here put it: "We seem to be playing the script the way Mao wrote it."

I think there is a great deal of merit in this statement. This is an aspect that is very difficult for Americans even to tolerate or consider, but it is one of the aspects that the Senate ought to consider, I do not know—I have not even heard a rumor—that the State Department has heard of such a theory or such an article. There is no evidence of it.

On August 30, 1966, an editorial in the People's Daily of Peking stated—and I only cite this because it makes much the same point as in the article by Mr. Karnow:

To be quite frank, if United States imperialism kept its forces in Europe and America, the Asian people would have no way of wiping them out. Now, as it is so obliging as to deliver its goods to the customer's door, the Asian people cannot but express welcome. The more forces United States imperialism throws into Asia, the more will it be bogged down there and the deeper will be the grave it digs for itself.

"... The tying down of large numbers of United States troops by the Asian people creates a favorable condition for the further growth of the anti-United States struggle of the people in other parts of the world. With all the people rising to attack it, one hitting at its head and the other at its feet, United States imperialism can be nibbled up bit by bit."

Obviously, I do not subscribe to some of the words and characterizations. I only read these as a warning that we do not necessarily know all there is to know about the capacity and the determination of the Asians. We are just beginning to sense that we have become bogged down, that we have become engaged in an undertaking that is far more expensive in lives and in many other ways than we had ever anticipated.

Before I close, I also ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record an article from the Christian Science Monitor of March 4, 1968, entitled "British Journalist Shifts on Vietnam."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

BRITISH JOURNALIST SHIFTS ON VIETNAM

WASHINGTON.—One of the warmest journalistic friends of the United States in the British islands has reluctantly concluded that the bad outweighs the good in the Vietnam war and that the United States should pull out even though "suffering the humiliation of withdrawal."

This is Peregrine Worsthorne, writing on the editorial page of the influential middle-class, conservative journal, the *London Sunday Telegraph*, Feb. 25. Up to this time, Mr. Worsthorne says that "I have defended the war most vehemently." It was his hope, he writes, "that the worst of the war should be over before this internal American disaffection—the revulsion of world opinion reached crisis proportions."

With the text somewhat compressed, the gist of Mr. Worsthorne's argument follows: "The case for and against the war was always highly debatable. But in my judgment, until recently, the balance of the argument just tipped in favor of the hawks. . . . It is not easy to go on making that case today. In the light of the Viet Cong's sensational reemergence, how many of South Vietnam's neighbors are still impressed by the value of American protection?"

"Are they not more likely to be drawing the conclusion, after the events of the last three weeks, that the American giant is tragically unable—however willing—to succeed in guerrilla war, except at a price in destruction which makes no possible sense?"

CONCLUSION DRAWN

"Reading the grim reports of how American artillery and aircraft are having to blast South Vietnamese cities—so as to recapture control from the Viet Cong—I cannot help concluding that what is being demonstrated today is not the validity of American protection but its brutal impotence: not the point of resisting Communist subversion but its ghastly futility."

"Instead of the Americans impressing the world with their strength and virtue, they are making themselves hated by some for what they are doing, and despised by the remainder for not doing it more efficaciously. . . ."

"This could all change . . . but I do not believe any longer that there is enough ground to justify what the Americans are being forced to do. . . ."

"It is not easy to exaggerate the harm being done to American public values, and even to the quality of American private life, by what he is being forced to do in Vietnam. It looks less and less certain that this intense, internal moral strain can be sustained without doing irreparable damage to the American body politic. . . . For my part, I no longer find it possible to be certain that fighting on—at such a terrible cost in degradation—will prove a less debilitating experience for the United States than suffering the humiliation of withdrawal."

"It is impossible, of course, to be certain. But when it comes to justifying the war there must be some real confidence that the sacrifice is worthwhile. Once the element of doubt becomes too large the justification sticks in the throat. During the last weeks, it seems to me, the element of doubt has grown to the point where one can go on supporting the United States only by shutting one's mind and closing one's eyes."

REACTION NOTED

"This, of course," is precisely the reaction which the Viet Cong tactics are aimed at producing. Unfortunately, this does not invalidate it. They have fought the Americans into an impossible psychological corner, and there is no more point in denying this than in denying the military danger at Khe Sanh. In both cases one might wish it were otherwise. But wishes will not make it so. The truth today is that the Americans are fighting a war for which no really plausible case can any longer be made. . . ."

"Once one concludes—as it is difficult, on the present evidence, not to do—that the Americans just do not have the skills and talents to fight this kind of war effectively, and that the longer and harder they try the more protracted and devastating their humiliation is bound to be. Then it becomes

the duty of a friend to say 'enough is enough. . . .'

"It is tempting to keep silent, out of loyalty and a desire not to add one tiny drop to America's torrent of tribulation, but surely the key consideration now is how best to minimize the damage to America and the free world, if America is forced to withdraw, and to make the process of reaching a decision to withdraw as relatively untraumatic as humanly possible. . . ."

"It is a miscalculated, although entirely understandable, exercise in American power—which has almost certainly failed in its purpose. No disgrace—indeed much honor—attaches to the United States for having sacrificed so much for so long, and there is no need to exaggerate an admission of failure into an orgy of national shame. . . ."

"The task now for the realist well-wishers is to stop justifying the war and to start calmly and without hysteria living with the fact that America cannot win it. It means for many—certainly for me—eating a large number of words. But at this juncture this seems, on balance, the least harmful thing to do."

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, this is simply another example of a man who consistently for the last several years has supported the administration's policy wholeheartedly, but has now seen the danger of it.

I also ask unanimous consent to insert in the *RECORD* a similar article from the *Washington Post* of March 1, 1968, by Flora Lewis, and an article from the *New York Times* of March 1, 1967.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

[From the *Washington Post*, Mar. 1, 1968]
MOOD OF PESSIMISM PREVAILS IN MEKONG
CAPITOL OF CANTHO
(By Flora Lewis)

CANTHO.—A mood of pessimism and bewilderment has spread through South Vietnam, more widely and with more devastation it seems than the Vietcong units themselves. Except for the few men at the top in Saigon, there is no question of whether or not the Tet offensive was a grave setback for the allies. The question is only how grave.

Here in the Mekong Delta capital of Cantho, it is evident that the loss is a good deal worse than it looks from Saigon. The reason Saigon hasn't collected all the bad news begins to show. Things are so disrupted that reports haven't come in. There is a figure for refugees who fled their homes in the provincial capitals of the region since the start of February—140,000 people. There is no figure for the district capitals, the small towns and the villages. The machinery of government isn't even working well enough to keep contact with the smaller places.

Nothing much has been done yet in this city, one of the country's largest, to move people out of the schools and pagodas to which they rushed and to provide temporary housing.

Why not? Because the money hasn't come, I was told. It sounds incredible.

"No, it's a real problem," an official said. "The planes aren't coming regularly, the mails are stopped. The provincial government isn't collecting much taxes because the market hardly functions and that is the main taxing point. The merchants won't give any more credit for materials, they're running out of money themselves. And, anyway, the tin roofing and the cement you'd need aren't available here."

This had been a relatively peaceful area. Until the new offensive, there hadn't been shooting in Cantho since an incident last August. Last night I stood on the roof of a building to watch the war. There are at-

tacks almost every night and every morning the task once again is to assess the new damages, report the newly dead.

Recovery, repair, rehabilitation, "picking up the pieces and going on," as a ranking American in Saigon put it, remains beyond the horizon. It is barely getting started. The people who've been working in the villages and the towns on "pacification" have had to run to the comparative safety of the cities. But there really isn't any place safe any more. The Vietcong are continuing to hit everywhere, not always in strength but enough to keep the country in semiparalysis.

The atmosphere in official places is peculiar. People come to work. The administrative machine appears to be there. But nothing much gets done. It's like an overturned car with the wheels still spinning furiously, but getting nowhere.

Most people are scared and don't mind saying so, more scared even than angry. The only thing that might be called a ground swell of popular opinion is an urgent wish to get it all over with.

The loss you hear most about in Cantho is the new science annex of the university. It has just been built and was the pride of the Delta, two attractive modern buildings. Now they are gutted shells. The Vietcong went in and artillery and aerial bombardment was ordered. It is said that afterwards, when the damage was complete, three bodies were found inside, not the well-armed company that had been reported.

One way or another, Americans here talk about the war with passion and bitterness. Few Vietnamese do. They speak with the dull tones of hopelessness, of tragedy beyond response or, anyway, beyond any response but the dogged effort to stay alive.

In all the confusion, the complexity, and the heartless intrigues people have accepted as the likeliest means of staying alive, one thing seems clear. More troops, more firepower, more fighting can't win anything. There isn't much left to win. There is only more to lose for everybody involved.

[From the *New York Times*, Mar. 1, 1968]
KENNAN ATTACKS VIETNAM POLICY AS MASSIVE, UNPARALLELED ERROR
(By Ronald Sullivan)

NEWARK, February 29.—George F. Kennan bitterly condemned President Johnson's Vietnam policy here tonight, characterizing it as a "massive miscalculation and error of policy, an error for which it is hard to find any parallels in our history."

Mr. Kennan, a historian, former diplomat and expert on foreign affairs, charged that the mounting United States military escalation in South Vietnam has been "so destructive to civilian life that no conceivable political outcome could justify the attendant suffering and destructiveness."

In a speech prepared for delivery before a large crowd of New Jersey supporters of Senator Eugene J. McCarthy of Minnesota, a candidate for the Democratic Presidential nomination, Mr. Kennan said that Mr. Johnson's military policy was "grievously unsound, devoid throughout of a plausible, coherent and realistic object."

Moreover, the former Ambassador to the Soviet Union charged, "the regime in South Vietnam was at the outset, and has remained, too weak, too timid, too selfish, too uninspiring to form a suitable or promising object of our support."

In addition, Mr. Kennan, a professor at the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton, said that the American military involvement "has clearly become as much of a burden, if not more, for those whom it was supposed to benefit as for those it was supposed to punish."

He declared that despite mounting opposition to further military escalation, the "Administration has pushed stubbornly

ahead with the prosecution of this military effort, steadily increasing the degree of commitment, rendering any peaceful liquidation of the conflict steadily more difficult, burning one bridge after another behind itself and ourselves, cutting one after the other of the possible paths of retreat."

"It is not an exaggeration to say that today, after four years of this dreadfully misconceived effort, we are in situation more serious than any we have known since the first months of 1942, and in some respects more serious than that," he declared.

Mr. Kennan angrily portrayed the President and his advisers "like men in a dream, seemingly insensitive to outside opinion, seemingly unable to arrive at any realistic assessment of the effects of their own acts."

He said the Administration had "acted as though it never heard the suggestion that a country such as ours owned 'a decent respect to the opinions of mankind.'"

In contrast, he hailed Senator McCarthy as a "spokesman for millions of Americans who would like to see this war terminated as rapidly and as peacefully as possible."

For Senator McCarthy, the scheduled appearance here tonight was his first campaign effort in New Jersey. A large group of dissident Democrats has organized a drive in the state to field delegates to the Democratic National Convention opposed to Mr. Johnson's renomination.

Senator McCarthy told the news conference at the Military Park Hotel that he had not yet decided whether to oppose the President in New Jersey. One of his supporters here said his decision would depend on the outcome of his primary fight against the President in New Hampshire on March 12.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I have one other article to insert in the RECORD, unless the Senator from Indiana inserted the Wall Street Journal article.

Mr. HARTKE. I did.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Then, I shall not place it in the RECORD.

Mr. President, I conclude by saying that I regret this debate was at least temporarily interrupted and an attempt made to ridicule the seriousness of the debate. I think it is an extremely serious matter. I think we are faced with a decision that the country is going to have to make. I was not aware of the fact that a Member of this body was not aware that serious consideration was being given by the administration as to where we go from here; how much we increase our commitment and forces or whether we make any move at all. But it is a time of reconsideration. There is no question about it. It is not a question of an anonymous rumor whatsoever. It is serious talk.

I have been approached by some of the highest officials in this Government, pleading with me to do this or that about other related subjects. I remind the Senate that it is not just Vietnam that we are talking about. We are talking about a deficit in the domestic budget that is running at the rate of some \$20 billion a year today, and no doubt will go higher.

Just suppose we do send 200,000 more men to Vietnam. We will be confronted with a supplemental request of an additional \$10 to \$15 billion, all added upon a deficit.

We have a huge deficit building up in our balance of payments. It was running at the rate of \$3.9 billion, I believe, the

last quarter of last year. We are going to be confronted with a request to vote on a gold cover bill, which removes all gold as the basis or backing for our currency; and our currency is already a lone stalwart seeking to hold up a crumbling international financial structure.

All of these things are directly attributable to this war; and I do not know how we can kid ourselves about it. Even the bill that is the business before the Senate today has a very great relation to the war in Vietnam. Were it not for the war diversion, the diversion of money in vast sums, the diversion of the attention of most of us, the executive and the legislature, to the war in Vietnam; were it not for our care and concern for the men who are being killed in increasing numbers every minute of every day, and have been now for some years we could concentrate in this country on the absolute fundamental duty that we owe to our own people here at home. It is the war which has distracted us.

All of this is one big difficult question, and it is not a laughing matter. It is not a matter to be cut off by technicalities on this floor. I do not think it is a matter that should be shoved under the rug, and everybody say, "Oh, well, that is the President's responsibility, let him make the decision and blame him for whatever happens."

He is already deep in this. He has already accumulated sufficient difficulties for one man to bear. I think it is time for the Senate to share that responsibility, and not only the Senate, but it is time for the country to share it. The Senate cannot share this responsibility until it is informed, until we have had a national debate of the fundamental questions and policies involved, and why.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the debate this afternoon, and I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Arkansas for undertaking to initiate the discussion which has occurred.

Frankly, I am a little unhappy, personally, because the questions of Vietnam, possible escalation, and other matters were brought into a cloture situation. But on reflection, I am not at all averse to what has happened, because there is a relationship between our situation over there, especially in Vietnam, and what we are doing under the invocation of cloture in this body today. Both situations interlock, and they are together the most important problems which confront this Nation at this time.

May I say that in my judgment, we are facing today the most troubling days in the entire history of the Republic, and I bar no period in making that statement.

May I say also that it is my intention to uphold the hand of the President as much as I can in this particular matter, and at the same time stick to my own convictions.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr.

President, may we have order in the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. The Senator from Montana may proceed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I think it is fair to say that regardless of how one feels about the situation in Vietnam, in Southeast Asia, and in Korea, the President has tried hard and vigorously and consistently to find a way to the negotiating table, to the end that an honorable truce could be achieved and an honorable settlement effected.

One may disagree with his San Antonio formula, or with his Johns Hopkins speech, but I hope Senators will not impugn his motives; and to the best of my knowledge, no one in this Chamber has.

He has tried. He has been unsuccessful. He has not gone as far as I would like; but he has done his best in a most difficult situation, the like of which has never confronted this country before, and I hope devoutly will never confront it again.

We are in the wrong place, and we are fighting the wrong kind of war; and those of us who try to say that if we do not fight there, we will be forced back to Hawaii or to California, ought to think and think again. Those who talk about the domino theory ought to get away from that cliché and look at the map and understand it; because there have been too many clichés. In that respect, I confess I have been as guilty as the next man, in trying to explain this struggle in which we are engaged.

There are those who say, "Win, go all the way, or get out." That sounds fine on the stump, and that may go well in our States, but it does not hold up in a consideration of the reality of the situation which confronts this Nation today, and those who say it know it.

I think also the President should be given 100 percent credit for the way in which he has handled the situation in North Korea vis-a-vis the *Pueblo* affair; and I think the Senate and the American people approve of what he is doing.

I would point out that one rash act in North Korea would very likely seal the doom and cause the killing of the 82 remaining members of the crew of the *Pueblo*; and not only that, but get this country involved in another land war in Asia—a second land war. For we are in one now, and it is more than enough.

In this instance, we should be prepared to face up to the Soviet Union and China, because, since 1961, mutual security agreements have been entered into between those two countries and North Korea. If there is an overt act or a rash act, those agreements will go into effect automatically.

So those who are militant, but who will not have to go to war, should think of those things for a change. They should think of the young men who are not making policy—we make the policy, in part—but who carry out that policy under their constitutional duties and obligations, as they should. Think of them, and think of what they are going through, and let us think a little less of ourselves. So I commend the President on that score.

I commend the President also—and I can speak personally of this—for being responsible, over the past months, for not inaugurating the doctrine of hot pursuit into the Kingdom of Cambodia. Someone has said that if we lose Vietnam, we lose Cambodia. We have never had Cambodia to lose, any more than we have ever had China and we were accused of losing China. Sihanouk knows what he is doing. He is trying to keep Cambodia for the Cambodians, away from us, away from the Chinese, the North and the South Vietnamese, the Thais, and all others.

In my opinion, Sihanouk is the ablest statesman in all of Southeast Asia, if not all of Asia. I am only sorry that there are not more Norodom Sihanouks looking after the interests of their own people and their own countries on their own. We could learn something from a man like that, instead of ridiculing him, as has been all too often the case since Cambodia achieved its independence.

I hope that someday the historians will go back to the Geneva Conference of 1954 and find out for themselves just how astute, how determined, and how wise Sihanouk was at that time. And I would hope that both the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services would be called into consultation before there would be any sizable increase in American manpower in Southeast Asia. I shall have more to say about that later.

I would hope, also, that we would stop, or at least restrain ourselves somewhat in going back 3½ years to the Gulf of Tonkin resolution. There is not a thing any man can do about it now. It is past history. And as the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken] said, this is something for the historians. What we have to do is to consider today and tomorrow, because that is what counts.

We cannot recall the Gulf of Tonkin resolution. If I knew then what I know today, I would have voted against it. However, I cannot operate on hindsight. I voted for the Gulf of Tonkin resolution.

Those witnesses who appeared before the Foreign Relations Committee were, in my opinion, honest and candid on the basis of the information at their disposal. And, as far as McNamara was concerned when he appeared some days ago before our committee in his farewell appearance, I think he was candid and honest in what he had to say about the intelligence activities of one or both of these destroyers.

There are great differences in this body. There are hawks so-called, and doves so-called. And I have no use for either name, because I do not believe there is a hawk in the Senate. Nor do I think there is a dove. A hawk wants to go all the way, even if it means going to Peking. And a dove wants to pull out unilaterally.

I know of no Senator who has advocated that.

I also get a little bit disturbed at the word "neo-isolationism," a term applied to somebody because he is not satisfied with what is going on in Vietnam and may exercise the right of dissent, a right guaranteed under the first amendment to the Constitution, and a right which

I will uphold, as long as it is constructive, for every Member of the Senate and for every American, because I think that is a part of the democratic process. In fact, it is the stuff of which democracy is made.

Dissent occupies an honored place in this country. And if we cannot dissent constructively, then I think we had better bow our neck and be prepared to live under a dictatorship. And I do not ever intend to.

A question has also been raised about the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Wheeler, being the most important man in the Government next to the President.

That just is not so. As far as I know and can ascertain, and I do this on my own initiative, General Wheeler is a good general trying to do a good job. He is called in by the President now and again. He makes a trip to Saigon now and again, and he makes speeches occasionally. But I have never seen any evidence of abuse of power as far as he is concerned.

We are going to have before us shortly, if not this month, next month, Resolution 187, a resolution reported unanimously by the Foreign Relations Committee, a resolution seeking to define more clearly the relationship which exists, or which should exist, between the executive and the legislative branches, and most especially the Senate. And I think that the Senate does have a role under the Constitution to play in the field of foreign policy. But I think also that the Senate itself has abdicated that role and is responsible for the diminution of its own power.

So, when that resolution, introduced by the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, comes up, I hope it is given the most serious consideration, because that is what it deserves.

May I repeat that I would hope and expect the Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Relations would be called into consultation, and I anticipate they will be, if any great shift occurs in the present situation which confronts all of us in Southeast Asia today.

Some questions have been raised as to the figures which the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee used in referring to a possible buildup of troop strength in Vietnam.

Every Senator has seen those figures in the press—every single one. And every Senator, I am sure, has raised questions as to how large the figure was going to be.

Prior to General Wheeler's return from Vietnam and Thailand, there were speculative reports that requests had been made to increase our forces in South Vietnam by 50,000 to 100,000 men. Since General Wheeler's return, the speculative reports and rumors have increased the figures to from 100,000 to 200,000 men. Whatever the figure, it appears that the pressure is on for an increase in U.S. strength in Vietnam above the 525,000 which had been set for July of this year. Before these forces are increased, I would most respectfully suggest that we face the realities of the past

4 years, see where we are, and try to look ahead.

Have we given enough consideration to peace suggestions and proposals, no matter how nebulous they may have been? I have in mind U Thant's proposal, backed by France and other nations. Perhaps. But I do not think so. Has North Vietnam given enough consideration to the San Antonio formula, as refined? Perhaps. But I do not believe it has given enough consideration. Therefore, we are at an impasse in the field of diplomacy, as we are in the area of the military situation.

What is the answer, if any? I say "if any" because there may not be an answer in the immediate future. But I do not believe that we should confess diplomatic failure and fall back on military answers only. Is that all we can think of? If we confess diplomatic failure—and I do not—then we face only a continuance of a grim escalation upon escalation on both sides. Are we prepared to face up to that gruesome project? Before doing so, it might be advisable to look at some facts and figures.

As of now, there are 1.3 million allied troops in South Vietnam, including 510,000 Americans. Opposed to them are an estimated 300,000 North Vietnamese and Vietcong troops. Of that number, it is estimated that 60,000 are North Vietnamese—60,000 of the 474,000 at General Giap's disposal in North Vietnam. Only one-eighth—one-eighth—of Giap's regular troops have been committed thus far. The overall ratio in the south is, roughly and conservatively, four to one on the allied side.

Furthermore, we—and this means the United States and its allies—have the helicopters, the fleets, and by far the greater preponderance of airpower. Nevertheless, our opponents have the initiative. They have fought at times and places of their own choosing. They have taken over much of the countryside and have forced the allies back toward the cities and to small, staked-out areas. They have probably killed off the pacification program, at least for the time being. They have added 500,000 more refugees for us to care for. They have pinned down a large segment of our combat strength at Khe Sanh.

The recent Tet offensive, in my judgment, was neither a defeat nor a death rattle for our opponents. It was, if anything, a confirmation of a stalemate.

These statements will, I believe, stand up under scrutiny. It is my belief, therefore, that we should not get in deeper, and that is what another addition of tens of thousands of men adds up to, because escalation only begets escalation. If we seek a clearcut military victory, then I suggest we will have to go far beyond the 100,000- or 200,000-man increase which has been rumored. We will have to raise taxes far beyond anything considered to date, impose wage and price controls, reinstitute regulation W, and be prepared to go on a full war footing, to carry on a war 10,000 miles from the continental United States. Are we prepared to be that much more of a hostage to the war in Vietnam? What national purpose is served thereby? It

would be well for all Senators and all our people to think this matter through.

Already there are voices of prominence advocating that we bomb the Red River dikes and thereby starve out North Vietnam. Would it?

Already there have been voices urging that we bomb North Vietnam back into the stone age. Would it profit us to do so, with China just waiting to move in?

Again, there are those who are advocating that we bomb the port of Haiphong and cut off the estimated 75 percent of the enemy's supplies which channel through there. Would it?

There are those among us advocating an invasion of North Vietnam, saying that this would win the war.

My answer to all these questions is in the negative.

I would point out my belief that today, with thousands of targets bombed, re-bombed, and bombed again, there are only enough significant targets untouched to amount to less than a score—to amount to less than a score—to amount to less than 20. It would seem to me that we would be well-advised not to heed the voices for further escalation and further destruction.

The war is in danger of becoming more open-ended than just Vietnam. If that takes place, no one knows where or how it will end. We do know that there will be, in reality, no victory for anyone, only a legacy of distrust, suspicion, hatred, and horror. Let us not destroy Vietnam in order to save it, because in so doing we may well end by destroying ourselves at home and abroad. Let us play down a military solution to the war and play up the possibility of an honorable, negotiated settlement. Let us give the most serious consideration to U Thant's proposal, and let North Vietnam give the most serious consideration to our 14 proposals. And let us give the most serious consideration to their four points. Let us jell the two together, and let us sit down and discuss these conditions and points of view. Let us put U Thant, as Secretary General of the United Nations, in the role of chief negotiator, as the honest broker. Surely such a procedure, or one along similar lines, would be far more preferable to more men, more ships, more taxes, more regulations, more war.

Coupled with U Thant's proposal, I would again call attention to the proposal of the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER]. It would confine the war to South Vietnam and would give full air protection to all our troops from the 17th parallel on down.

I would also call attention to this body's resolution, the so-called U.N. resolution on Vietnam, which passed the Senate unanimously, and call upon the administration again to push the issue, to bring it before the Security Council, and to let the members of that council stand up and be counted. I would want that to be done win or lose, because I say again, as I close, that, in my opinion, the troublous days which confront us now at home and abroad are the most dangerous since the founding of the Republic.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, it is hard to know what can be added to the eloquent words that have already been

spoken on this floor this afternoon by the Senator from Montana, who just held our attention, the Senator from Arkansas, the Senator from New York, and others. I wish to express my appreciation as a Member of the Senate and as a citizen of this country for what I regard as possibly the most significant discussion held on the Senate floor in many years.

I hope, with all my heart, that what has been started here this afternoon may in some way lead to a fundamental reassessment of the disastrous course we have been following in Vietnam in recent years, in which each new evidence of disaster has been followed, not by a change in our policy, but by a compounding of the very formula that brought us to the crisis which confronts us now.

If anything has been demonstrated here this afternoon it is not that we stand in agreement on this question.

What has been demonstrated is that the real strength of our system of government depends on the right of free debate and the exchange of ideas. We have been needing that kind of frank and open discussion of this issue for a long time.

I happen to feel that our policy represents the greatest and most unfortunate miscalculation in our national history. However, those who support it should be as interested as those of us who dissent in having the matter subjected to full, open, and frank debate. If the policy has some strength to it, that strength will be better revealed in open and honest discussion. But the great threat to the security of the United States will come at the moment we silence open discussion on this issue.

I was appalled by a story which was published on the front page of the Washington Post this morning which tells us that in one of the primary elections in this country, on a public platform where he hopes to open an examination of the issues before this body and where there is no stand-in for the administration another Member of this body, the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY] has had his patriotism and integrity impugned in his bid for the Presidency.

Mr. President, every Member on both sides of the aisle regards Senator McCARTHY as a man of impeccable patriotism and unchallenged integrity. However, we read in this morning's newspaper that—

President Johnson's campaign managers warned in a radio advertisement today that "the Communists in Vietnam are watching the New Hampshire primary . . . to see if we here at home have the same determination as our soldiers . . . Don't vote for fuzzy thinking and surrender."

I am very sure that the President of the United States has had nothing to do with such despicable and un-American campaign tactics. The person who signed that advertisement is not a Democrat, spelled with a big "D" or a small "d."

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, may we have order so the Senators can hear?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the

person who signed that advertisement does not understand what America is all about. Those are tactics of Hitler's Germany and Stalin's Russia. Those are tactics that would silence free and open discussion of honest differences of opinion.

I do not particularly care whether the Vietcong is watching our debate. Our responsibility is not to them. We have no obligation as elected officials to concentrate our attention either on pleasing the Vietcong or worrying about some misunderstanding on their part about democracy.

As the junior Senator from Wisconsin said on this floor several times, it will be a tragedy if we fight so blindly and fanatically to try to establish freedom in South Vietnam that we sacrifice it here at home. The people watching us that we do care about are the people of the United States, our constituents, and our people. Our responsibility is prescribed by those policies that are in the interests of the United States, that will advance the people's interest all over the country, and that will achieve the goal of peace and freedom around the world.

Mr. President, I wish to make perfectly clear that those who appeal to us on the grounds that we ought to demonstrate this same patriotism our troops are demonstrating in Vietnam miss the whole point. The patriotism of our troops is not at issue here. As General Gavin said in a recent article, no responsible American is questioning the integrity and patriotism of the American soldier.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a unanimous-consent request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is not in order.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a motion, without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. McGOVERN. I yield.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed, in view of the fact that there will be no more debate on the pending civil rights bill, to clear the floor of all staff personnel except the members of the staff of the Secretary of the Senate, the Sergeant at Arms, the secretary of the majority, the secretary of the minority, and the two policy committees.

Mr. ALLOTT. I object. I have unanimous consent that a member of my staff, Mr. Joseph Blake, be present and I want it to hold. He is the only member of my staff or the committee staff with whom I have to work on the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That still holds.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I renew my request, with the exception of the Senator's request.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, this debate has been entirely on a subject related to the Committee on Foreign Relations, rather than the staff of the committee handling the bill, and the staff of the Committee on Foreign Relations should be here because they are necessary for keeping track of the record.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator has only to ask unanimous consent to have them stay.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that members of the staff of the Committee on Foreign Relations be permitted to stay.

Mr. CLARK. Regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request is granted.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I understand the Chair ruled without objection that the request of the Senator from West Virginia was granted. I was on my feet prepared to speak.

I have a member of my staff whom I want very much on the floor during the debate. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Harry K. Schwartz be permitted to stay.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senate will be in order. The Senate is not in order.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, to continue the remarks I was making with reference to the special responsibility we have to our troops in combat, I think the point made by the Senator from Montana is well taken that it does not really require very much courage or patriotism to stand on the floor of the Senate and cheer our troops on to their deaths. Our responsibility would be abandoned by that kind of blind endorsement of a policy that we believe to be mistaken and not in the national interest.

Mr. President, if my son were fighting in Vietnam, either at Khe Sanh or any other point where bloodshed is taking place on a mounting scale, I would not applaud the public official who endorsed without question every aspect of the policy which put him there. I would applaud the Members of the Senate and the members of the Government who stood by their convictions and argued them with all the force they could muster. The integrity, security, and welfare of our troops depend not on unquestioning approval of every request sent to the Senate, but on how conscientiously we discharge our duties in order to bring the best possible thought we can to this very complicated issue.

It is my judgment that for many months we have been following a strategy in Southeast Asia that plays directly into the hands of the most militant and aggressive strategists in the Communist world; that if we had tried to find some way, 2 or 3 years ago, to figure out a strategy that would weaken the United States and get us overcommitted and overinvolved in such a way as to give maximum advantage to Peking and Moscow, we could not improve very much on the strategy we have been following in recent years.

As for the argument that those of us who warn against the course we are now following are guilty of fuzzy thinking, as the article asserts, I think that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON] made very clear a few moments ago that there has been some rather fuzzy thinking on the part of those of us who have given assurance that the course we are following is the correct one.

I remember very well the experience

that eight or 10 Members of the Senate had in the summer of 1964. As I recall, it was in late August or early September of 1964 when Secretary of Defense McNamara—whom I still regard as one of the most able men ever to serve in the U.S. Government—came up to the Hill to meet with us informally.

He explained at that time when, as I remember, we had about 16,000 American troops in Vietnam, why he was opposed to sending in additional forces.

He said to do that would not reduce our casualties but would increase them because each time we sent another American soldier into the Vietnamese jungle, it was simply setting up another target for the Vietcong to shoot at. He said, furthermore, that if we continued to build up our American troop commitment there, we would turn it into an American war in which the American presence would become so obvious that the Vietnamese national identity would be eclipsed.

Mr. President, I think that was good logic and sound judgment at that time; but the regrettable thing is that we lost sight of it. We have heard thoughtful suggestions here that what the war has now become is a contest to determine whether the United States is big and powerful enough to defeat Vietnam. That was not our original purpose. The original purpose was to see whether, by limited assistance, we could encourage the development of a program in South Vietnam which would provide a non-Communist alternative to the regime in North Vietnam and to the insurrectionist forces in South Vietnam.

The great tragedy of this war is that each step, however limited it appeared at the time, has merely set the stage for further escalation.

To me, one of the saddest news stories to come out of the war to date came to us 2 or 3 weeks ago when a young American major was explaining why we had to destroy the city of Ben Tray—a city of perhaps 35,000 to 40,000 people—which was leveled by American artillery, helicopter gun ships, and heavy bombardment. This young major, doubtless a brave and dedicated man, told the American reporter that it became necessary to destroy the city in order to save it.

That, Mr. President, is the irony of this whole war. We became involved in the first place to reduce the loss of life, to reduce terror, and to stop the bloodshed. Instead, we have compounded it on a scale almost beyond imagination.

Mr. President, I am sure that if we continue on that course, we can demonstrate that we have the capacity to destroy South Vietnam. We can destroy the guerrillas and destroy three, four, or five innocent citizens for every guerrilla we wipe out. We can drop more bombs on North Vietnam. I have no doubt about that, because we have not unleashed our full military power. If what we are trying to prove is that the most powerful and richest country on the face of the earth can defeat one of the smallest, most impoverished, and most backward states on the face of the earth, we can probably demonstrate that capacity.

But, in doing so, as the Senator from New York has said, we will be engaging in the most immoral, the most unwise, and the most impolitic course in our national history.

I hope that the debate this afternoon will help reverse that course.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I shall make but a few remarks—

Mr. FULBRIGHT. On whose time? [Laughter.]

Mr. LAUSCHE. On my time.

I suggest to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations that instead of talking continuously on this subject, he introduce a resolution to the Senate—one, to repeal the Gulf of Tonkin resolution; two, if he does not want to do that, then a resolution to adopt the Gavin enclave recommendation; and, three, if he does not want to do either of the first two, then to present a resolution to declare that we pull out of South Vietnam and raise the white flag of surrender.

Mr. President, let us quit talking. Let us quit being divided. Let us reach a decision.

The only way we can reach a decision, instead of talking, is for the Senator from Arkansas to present a resolution to the Senate so that we will not be discussing matters in the abstract but will go right to the heart of the matter. Until he does that, I suggest that he quit talking.

I too am distressed with what is happening to the youth of the United States in South Vietnam but these acrimonious controversies will not lessen the losses.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the purpose of the debate, I call to the attention of my good friend from Ohio—who I see is about to leave the Chamber—is to put the President on notice that the Senate has a right to know whether the Commander in Chief intends further to escalate this horrible war.

The Senate, I take it, has a right to advise the President in that regard. Perhaps it has a duty to consent. I am amazed that any Senator should call that point into question. There is nothing here involved as to whether the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations should bring in this, that, or the other resolution. The only point is whether we have a right to be consulted before the war is further escalated.

In my opinion, we are still a democracy. We are entitled to an answer from the White House to the searching questions which have been asked this afternoon by the Senator from Arkansas, the Senator from Montana, the Senator from New York, the Senator from South Dakota, the Senator from Idaho, and other Senators.

I hope that that answer will be forthcoming.

Mr. President, I think I was the last member of the Committee on Foreign Relations to visit Vietnam. I was the last American tourist to be taken through the magnificent citadel at Hue before it was destroyed. The able and effective American officer who took me through is now dead. The citadel was destroyed. Havoc has broken out all over the land.

When I came back I wrote a report for

the Foreign Relations Committee, entitled "Stalemate in Vietnam." That will be available to Senators and the general public at the end of this week. I would like briefly to refer to some of the conclusions and recommendations in the report.

First, the war in Vietnam is at a stalemate which neither side can convert into a military victory without leaving the country—and perhaps the world—in ruins.

Next, not only the military but also the political war is at a stalemate, distasteful though that word is to the administration—a stalemate which becomes more apparent with every day of continued bitter and costly fighting. As we increase the pressure, so does the enemy. We must take the initiative to stop this bloody, indeterminate conflict.

Our national unity is seriously threatened by the divisiveness caused by deeply held conflicting opinions about the war. Democracy, to be successful, needs an underlying consensus on matters of principle. This we learned from the controversy over slavery at the time of the Civil War. The political fabric of our society is at the tearing point. The traditional democratic concept of alternatives being presented to the voters sufficiently within a national consensus to permit the maintenance of law and order, no matter who wins, is no longer accepted by a large segment of our society. The divisiveness over Vietnam is running deeper every day.

Vietnam is a cancer which is devouring our youth, our morals, our national wealth, and the energies of our leadership. The casualty list from this war only begins on the battlefield. As victims, we must also count the programs of the Great Society, the balance of payments, a sound budget, a stable dollar, the world's good will, detente with the Soviet Union, and hopes for a durable world peace. The toll of this war can never be measured in terms of lives lost and dollars spent—they are only the tip of a vast iceberg whose bulk can never be accurately measured.

We are not likely to end the war by a military victory. This has been amply demonstrated by the recent Vietcong offensive. This is primarily a political war, a war which cannot be won by bullets and bombs short of annihilation of both the enemy and the people for whom we fight.

Nor can we get out by unilateral withdrawal, attractive as that may appear to some.

And there is not a Senator in this Chamber—and I wish the Senator from Texas were still here, but he had to leave, and I can understand that—nor has there been, who advocates a unilateral withdrawal or a policy of "scuttle and run" from Vietnam. Nor is this suggested as an alternative to the present policy. I say that is a straw man set up to be destroyed. Nobody is advocating a unilateral withdrawal from Vietnam, and it adds nothing to suggest that that is the only alternative.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. HART. I recall distinctly that, more than a year ago, the Senator from

Pennsylvania, in a commencement address, which I thought was a very interesting and profound address, made clear his position. If anybody ever thought the Senator from Pennsylvania was in favor of a "cut and run" policy, he was 100 percent wrong. The Senator's position at that time, and now, is that face saving is an Asian problem; it ought not to be ours; that we ought to recognize that, having gotten in there, unhappily, we now must make clear that political problems are not going to be solved by the application of force, and that we did have the obligation to insure against that in connection with our involvement in Vietnam. I remember that distinctly.

On that precise point I recall clearly that the Senator from Pennsylvania has never proposed a cut-and-run policy. If anybody thought the Senator from Pennsylvania favored a cut-and-run policy, he was 100 percent wrong. My memory goes back to a speech made by Senator CLARK at Haverford College in 1966. It so impressed me that I have "plagiarized" it on occasion; so frequently, indeed, that I can quote it almost exactly:

The United States should get out of Vietnam as soon as it can with decency. Our foreign policy should be above dealing in status symbols. Face saving is an oriental, not a Western, requirement.

I believe this, too. He went on to say we should not have gotten onto mainland Asia with large ground forces. I believe this, too. But he also said that, now that we were there, "it is important to make clear to Hanoi and China that force is no longer an acceptable method of solving political problems. So we cannot afford to be driven into the sea, or to withdraw unilaterally, surrendering all of South Vietnam to the undoubted terrorism of the Vietcong and their North Vietnamese allies." That also I believe. And that is no cut-and-run position. Because I was so impressed by Senator CLARK's speech and have referred so often to it I am sure my quotation of it is very close to exact. It is a good position; it is his position, and it is mine. The means to peace are difficult and we do not agree on all the steps, but agree fully our escalation should be pursuit of the means.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from Michigan for his helpful intervention. He has correctly stated my position then and now.

Mr. HART. May I add that he persuaded me to that viewpoint.

Mr. CLARK. I again thank the Senator.

Mr. President, there could be any number of scenarios as to how this unhappy war could be brought to an end. I have set forth one in my report. It is a solution. It is not necessarily the solution.

I am not going to detain the Senate this evening by going into it. Senators who are interested in it will find it in the report. But I close my comments this afternoon with the last paragraph of this report.

In short, we are stalemated in Vietnam as we were in Korea 15 years ago. We must take the action we took then; seize the initiative to reach a compromise solution—without military victory but also without defeat. And never, never

again should we commit a ground army on the mainland of Asia.

Mr. President, I hope the debate this afternoon, if it has done nothing else, will persuade the President, whom I honor and whom so far I have supported, to come, in all candor, to the Congress of the United States to tell us his plans, to permit us to debate them, to give us that part in the decision of whether there should be escalation of this war to which, in my opinion, we are entitled under the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I rise to support the words of the Senator from Arkansas in advocating a discussion and a public debate on the direction of our policy in Vietnam, what our objectives are, and to ascertain where our real national interests are. And in this connection, I know there is no man who wants peace more than does President Johnson.

I have been struck, as a relatively new member of the Foreign Relations Committee, by the fact that when I went on the committee in January 1965, there was considerable indecision and open-mindedness with regard to what our policy in Vietnam should be. In the course of the intervening 3 or 3½ years, I have seen that committee, a group of 19 thoughtful and intelligent men, probably exposed more than any other group of Congress to the pros and cons of Vietnam, develop an increasing disenchantment—at least among the majority of its members—with our policy.

I would think, and I would wager too, that if there is adequate, open debate about our policy in the Senate, and if Senators participated, asked questions, received answers, and then, if they were dissatisfied, followed up on them, that there might be a shift in sentiment in the Senate just as there has been in the Foreign Relations Committee. And just as I think there would be in the country as a whole.

That is why personally I believe in the idea of open hearings of the Foreign Relations Committee, because I think, as the American citizen, the American gas station attendant, the plumber, the American housewife, listens to the debate and the indepth questions and answers, they will form a pretty good idea of where the true interest of America lies and what is our most sensible policy.

In this connection, too, I find myself in complete, wholehearted agreement with the views that were expressed far more eloquently and in more scholarly form than I could have expressed them by the senior Senator from Montana.

Again speaking personally, I believe that the policies we have followed in these past several years in Vietnam have been against our national interest and, as has been suggested in the course of the debate, almost appear as if they might have been drawn up and scenario worked out by some little evil genie sitting somewhere in Peking or the Kremlin.

We know that is not the case. I am in no way impugning the motives of those who make these plans. But it looks as though what we are doing is more to the advantage of those who oppose us than of those in whose cause we believe.

Finally, too, I think that all of us as individuals face a terrible quandary. If we express our doubts publicly too vehemently, we may then be, as happened to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY] yesterday in New Hampshire, accused of a lack of patriotism.

I think most of us here are veterans, have fought in various of our country's wars, and have had our own experiences with enemies of the United States; and I would suggest that the patriotism of us all is equal. Yet, when we are faced with this situation, and we question publicly, the policy we are following, we are concerned that we might hurt the morale of our young men overseas, which is a very important point, or that our words may be fastened upon by Radio Hanoi, Radio Peking, or Radio Moscow.

But what is the alternative? The alternative is to favor greater harm to our national interest through following a policy which some of us, I for one, think is bound, if it keeps going the way it has, for disaster; a policy which, if the war had ended yesterday, we would be worse off for having followed than if a year ago it had ended—or we had begun following a deescalating policy.

What is my own policy? For I think all of us who are critical have an obligation to say in what we believe.

I know that for more than 3 years now, I for one have felt we should cease the bombing in the north and pursue deescalation in the south. I continue to believe that way, but I shall not burden the Senate now with the reasons for my view, which were stated in a long speech I gave a few months ago.

However, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an article entitled "We Can Get Out of Vietnam," written by Gen. James M. Gavin, and published recently in the Saturday Evening Post. General Gavin, together with General Ridgway and General Shoup, has ideas with which, while not in complete agreement, I agree generally, regarding our strategy in Vietnam.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE CAN GET OUT OF VIETNAM

(By James M. Gavin, in collaboration with Arthur T. Hadley)

Vietnam is the least-understood conflict in our nation's history. We have committed more than 480,000 troops and the might of our air and sea power. We have fought skillfully and bravely. Yet "victory" is nowhere in sight. Will more troops bring a quicker victory? More air strikes?

Unfortunately, there will be no "victory" in Vietnam. Only more victims. This is the difficult and unfortunate truth we have yet to understand. To see the Vietnam problem, we must first trace briefly the history of our involvement there, and then set Vietnam in the context of our present military and diplomatic capabilities. When we have done that, we may not have "victory," but we can at least plan toward a successful conclusion of the war.

Before beginning this study of the Vietnamese situation, I want to make one point absolutely clear. On the level of combat itself Vietnam is the best-fought war in our history. I have watched officers and noncoms leading the troops in the field, and they are highly professional; the troops start out well-trained, battle-ready. Americans, whatever

they think of the conflict, can be proud of these soldiers and their dedication. Let no debate on Vietnam divide us from the knowledge of our soldiers' courage. The errors of this tragic war are made not on the battlefield but in Washington.

My own involvement with Vietnam began in 1954. I was then Chief of Plans of the Army, serving under Matthew B. Ridgway, the Chief of Staff. I had served with him in the past—a man of incisive intelligence and great moral courage, a good man to work for.

In 1954 the French in Vietnam were involved at Dienbienphu. They had dug into this isolated fortified area to provoke the Vietminh into a major battle in which the Communist troops would be destroyed. But then it became clear that the battle was not going as the French had planned. They stepped up their already tremendous demands on the United States for war material.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff had been doubtful about the Dienbienphu strategy from the beginning. I felt that genuine French concessions to make Vietnam independent were far more important than mere firepower.

As the situation at Dienbienphu worsened, the French in desperation asked us for carrier strikes against the attacking Communists. Adm. Arthur W. Radford, then Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and a strong advocate of carrier air power, favored this. So did Gen. Nathan F. Twining, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, and Adm. Robert B. Carney, Chief of Naval Operations. There was even talk of using one or two nuclear weapons. Our allies, sounded out by Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, were opposed. General Ridgway believed that the air attacks would be indecisive, and that they would lead to involvement of American ground troops. We in the Army felt that this was a war that America certainly did not want.

Ridgway carried his disagreement to President Eisenhower, who finally decided against the air strike. I am convinced that Ridgway, along with our allies, played a crucial role in aborting this 1954 effort to involve us in Vietnam.

Dienbienphu fell on May 7. The next day the French and the Vietminh met in Geneva and—with speed that surprised us in the Pentagon—agreed to end the war. They wrote the Geneva accords of July, 1954, partitioning Vietnam at the 17th parallel into North and South Vietnam, and providing for nationwide elections to be held by July 20, 1956, to decide the nature of reunification.

To understand what happened next, it is important to understand the attitude of the Pentagon in 1954, because this attitude produced the initial decisions that led to where we are in Vietnam today and because this attitude is still all too prevalent in our military thinking.

In 1954 the Korean War controlled Pentagon thinking. For the Air Force it had been a disillusioning and frustrating experience. They had assumed that air power would demolish the North Korean military. They had trumpeted this point of view to the public and to the President. When bombing failed to halt the North Korean war effort, the Air Force developed the myth of the Yalu sanctuary. If only they could bomb Manchuria, beyond the Yalu, everything would turn out all right. Thus, at least in public, the Air Force was able to avoid confronting the evidence that in Korea air power had failed, strategically and tactically. Unfortunately, from their frustration sprang a readiness to reply to any challenge to American power with threats of total nuclear war.

To the Army, Korea had been embittering and costly. Of the more than 147,000 casualties, most had been in the ground forces. Despite the Army's wealth of combat experience, abundant logistical support and modern equipment, major units had been surprised and routed by Chinese forces. We felt that more Korea-type wars—wars fought out

on the ground—were a possibility, and that we should have funds to train and equip ourselves for them. Instead, we were beginning to feel the pressure of the "new look" cutbacks that flowed out of the doctrine of massive retaliation. Our funds and troop strengths were slashed, while the forces for strategic nuclear bombing were built up.

In addition all of us in the Pentagon—and I include myself—tended to see the world in terms of good guys and bad guys. It was a simple vision, and in the era of Stalinism it held much truth.

Still, we should have been wiser. We assumed that Peking was a pawn of Moscow, that Russia—thwarted in Europe by NATO and the Marshall Plan—was on the march in Asia. The Communist world was assumed to be an integrated, monolithic block. Only a few of us were beginning to distinguish between the nationalistic Communism of Tito and the Stalinism of Russia. And even fewer extended that concept to Ho Chi Minh's brand of Communism in Vietnam. The whole idea was near-heresy, but the fact was that Communism was changing; the future would show that there were brands of nationalistic Communism with which the United States could quite safely coexist.

This was the Pentagon atmosphere as we followed the Geneva talks. We felt that the French, despite the lavish support they had had from us, were acting almost entirely out of self-interest—protecting French investments—rather than in the interest of democracy as a whole.

With the folding of the French the Pentagon staff assumed that the burden of fighting Communism in Asia had now fallen upon the United States. Secretary of State Dulles and the CIA agreed with the Pentagon. At that time Secretary Dulles was building a paper wall of treaties to contain Communism. The Joint Chiefs began a high-priority study of a proposal to send combat troops into the Red River Delta of North Vietnam.

It was my responsibility as Chief of Plans of the Army Staff to recommend a position for the Army. I began by bringing in Asian experts. We had to face the fact that if we entered North Vietnam we were, in effect, going to war with Red China. Red China would be providing most of the arms, vehicles and ammunition, and would feel that our move was a threat to her national self-interest.

(Let me reiterate: the Army staff and I wanted no war with Red China. We argued forcefully and frequently against such a war. We simply considered the alternatives.)

The Army staff anticipated a bloody and costly war that would engage a tremendous portion of our manpower and resources, at the expense of our obligations in other parts of the world and at home.

As they had during the Dienbienphu crisis, the Joint Chiefs divided. Admiral Radford strongly favored landing a force in the Haiphong-Hanoi area, even at the risk of war with Red China. The Chief of Staff of the Air Force and the Chief of Naval Operations supported him.

In my opinion the risk of war would have been great. Just southeast of Haiphong harbor is the island of Hainan, which is actually part of Red China. The Navy was unwilling to risk ships in the Haiphong area without first taking the island.

Once more the embattled Ridgway dissented. Using the staff study we had prepared in the Army, he wrote directly to President Eisenhower, pointing out the hazards of a war in Vietnam. Again, fortunately, the President decided not to commit U.S. forces to Southeast Asia.

However, there was a compromise. We decided to support what he hoped would be a stable, representative, independent government in South Vietnam. The fact that this was contrary to the Geneva accords seemed irrelevant.

We thought then that our most serious problem was the selection of a premier for South Vietnam, to serve under the technical head of state, Emperor Bao Dai. The job fell to Ngo Dinh Diem.

I visited Saigon early in 1955 to discuss political and military-aid matters. I met Diem, who struck me as very nonpolitical, self-centered and quite unresponsive to the needs of his people. Nonetheless, the Defense Department, the State Department and the CIA supported him. Once more we were acting from honest conviction: The world was black and white, no gray in between. We had stopped Communism in Europe. We had stopped it in Korea. Now we were going to stop it at the 17th parallel in Vietnam.

On July 16, 1955, the Diem government announced—with American backing—that it would not comply with the provision of the Geneva accords calling for free elections. The reason given was that free choice was impossible in the North. In supporting Diem in this, the United States violated its own unilateral "Declaration of Support for the Geneva Conference."

At the time of Diem's announcement there still were significant numbers of French troops in South Vietnam. But thereafter the French began thinning out rapidly. On October 26, 1955, Premier Diem deposed the absentee Emperor Bao Dai and became the first president of the Republic of South Vietnam. President Eisenhower wrote to Diem offering U.S. assistance "in maintaining a strong, viable state, capable of resisting attempted subversion or aggression." Later President Eisenhower explained that this meant aid only. And during his Administration the U.S. Military Advisory and Assistance Group did not increase significantly; it averaged 650 men.

President Kennedy began to occupy himself with Southeast Asia immediately after his inauguration. By then the resistance movement in South Vietnam by the National Liberation Front, or Viet Cong, had gained strength.

My growing concern with the doctrine of "massive retaliation" and American overreliance on nuclear weapons led me to resign in 1958. With the election of President Kennedy I returned to government service as Ambassador to France. Early in the Kennedy Administration the United States accepted the independence of Laos, led by Prince Souvanna Phouma, whom many in our Government believed to be Communist-controlled if not outright Communist. During the negotiations I met several times with Souvanna Phouma in Paris, at the request of President Kennedy, to persuade him that he could trust the United States.

While Laos then is not Vietnam now, there are distinct parallels. The Laotian experience convinced me of the need to work with national leaders of all political persuasions, as we had with Tito in Yugoslavia. Laos also convinced me of the fallacy of the falling-domino theory. Laos went neutral. Neither Cambodia nor Thailand fell.

In the meantime things were not going well with Diem's government in Vietnam, though we were doing our verbal best to help him. Vice President Johnson, visiting there in 1961, referred to Diem as the "Churchill of today." Yet the Diem government became more isolated and oppressive. And by 1963 the war in Vietnam also was going very badly. President Kennedy was having grave doubts about our course of action (we now had more than 15,000 men there). Recent books have indicated the depth and bitterness of the division in the Kennedy Administration over Vietnam.

The President himself stated publicly:

"In the final analysis it is their war. They are the ones that have to win it or lose it. We can help them, give them equipment. We can send our men out there as advisers. But they have to win it."

However, the President's military advisers continued to tell him the war was going well. On October 2, 1963, after another quick Vietnam trip, McNamara insisted that the President issue the following statement:

"The military program in South Vietnam has made progress and is sound in principle, though improvements are being energetically sought. . . . Secretary McNamara and Gen. Maxwell Taylor reported their judgment that the major part of the United States military task can be completed by the end of 1965. . . . They reported that by the end of this year [1963] the U.S. program for training Vietnamese should have progressed to the point that one thousand U.S. military personnel assigned to South Vietnam can be withdrawn."

There has been much speculation about what President Kennedy would or would not have done in Vietnam had he lived. Having discussed military affairs with him often and in detail for 15 years, I know he was totally opposed to the introduction of combat troops in Southeast Asia. His public statements just before his murder support this view. Let us not lay on the dead the blame for our own failures.

By 1964 Vietnam had become a major political issue in the presidential campaign. (There were, by then, 23,000 U.S. troops there, mostly advisers.) President Johnson said: "We aren't going to send American boys nine thousand or ten thousand miles away to do what the Asian boys ought to be doing for themselves."

In August of 1964, in circumstances still not totally clear, two U.S. destroyers were attacked in Tonkin Bay by North Vietnamese PT boats. In the excitement following the attack, Congress, at the behest of the Administration, adopted the Southeast Asia (Tonkin Bay) Resolution upon which the Administration bases its actions today. On February 7, 1965, the first air strikes were ordered against North Vietnam. On March 6, U.S. Marines were ordered to land in the Danang area, north of Saigon. By October of 1965, American forces in South Vietnam totaled 132,300.

At this time it was already perfectly clear to me that as a military operation Vietnam made no sense. It was obvious that bombing was not going to bring Ho Chi Minh to his knees. This was the lesson of World War II bombing—German war production actually rose despite the devastating attacks. And—more immediately to the point—it was the lesson learned by the British in the war they won against Communist guerrillas in Malaya. The British high command began bombing suspected guerrilla areas but stopped when they found that the bombing's indiscriminate brutality alienated the people and strengthened the guerrillas.

It followed, then, that to get our "victory" we would have to commit an ever-growing number of ground troops. But this is no panacea either. There are definite contributions that ground troops, handled with sophistication, can make in a guerrilla war, but if the people of the country like the guerrillas better than they like the government that the foreign troops are supporting, the mere pouring in of more and better-equipped ground troops won't win the war.

As the government at Saigon did not appear to have this popular support, I believed the war would not go well, and that when this became clear the Pentagon and certain sections of Congress would call for more troops and heavier bombing until we escalated into a direct confrontation with Red China. This could lead directly to a nuclear World War III.

With this grave concern I tried in my own mind to develop some strategy that could stop the escalation and end the war. I evolved in 1965 what has come to be known as the "enclave" strategy. And I promptly found myself at the center of violent con-

troversy. I believe that the enclave strategy is even more valid today than it was in 1965. Combined with a halt in the bombing of North Vietnam, it would constitute a vital first step in our de-escalation of the war.

I reasoned that a primary tactical problem, once a war occurs, is to keep it limited. This is particularly true of a war in which we should not have become involved, and in which U.S. interests are, at best, marginal. Therefore I sought a way to halt the buildup, hold what we had, and open negotiations for peace.

By the fall of 1965 the United States had built up enclaves—vast logistical facilities at Cam Ranh Bay, Danang, Saigon and other places. If we concentrated in these centers, we could immediately stop the ever-increasing inflow of U.S. troops and probably reduce the number of men involved. At the same time, we could encourage the development of democracy in the large areas dominated by these enclaves, and could help the South Vietnamese bring their own troops to a high standard of combat performance.

While doing this, we could search for a diplomatic solution of the war, using our hold on the big enclaves as a decisive counter in the bargaining.

I fully realize the problems of negotiating with the N.L.F. and the North Vietnamese. They are a tough, determined foe. They have fought the Japanese, European colonists, and Americans for more than 20 years. Our knowledge of them is distorted by distance and by propaganda—ours and theirs.

The Hanoi government has several times stated its position on ending the war, probably most significantly in the four points laid down by Premier Pham Van Dong on April 13, 1965:

1. In accordance with the Geneva Agreement, the United States must withdraw from South Vietnam United States troops, military bases, etc.

2. Pending the peaceful reunification of Vietnam, the provisions of the 1954 Geneva Agreement pertaining to no military alliances, foreign bases, etc., must be respected.

3. The internal affairs of South Vietnam must be settled in accordance with the N.L.F. program.

4. The peaceful reunification of Vietnam is to be settled by the Vietnamese people in both zones, without any foreign interference.

Hanoi has indicated on several occasions that these points were a basis for talks rather than preconditions. Their more recent statement was that they would talk if the bombing stopped.

Meanwhile, the war assumes a distinct Orwellian character. Images of violence and blood flash into our living rooms on TV screens. The goal and principles for which we began the conflict lie close to forgotten. Brave men die. Experts in Vietnam told me privately that the war could last 5 to 10 more years. Yet both sides seem to lack the will, or the ability, to extricate themselves from the nightmare.

We seem to have forgotten that one of the vital aspects of a limited war is that it be limited in time also. A war may involve a minor portion of the total resources of a nation and may be limited to a small area; but if it goes on for four or five years at a reasonably intense level, it is not truly limited.

A Vietnamese solution, based on a "free, neutral and independent" nation—on the pattern of Laos—should be acceptable in Vietnam. Such a government, without ties to China, the Soviet Union or the West, would be in the best interests of Vietnamese and Americans. I do not believe that Ho Chi Minh ever wanted to be a puppet or satellite of China, or of Russia. The information we have indicates he is a patriot, an intense nationalist, albeit a Communist—a Tito.

In Vietnam, war forces the N.L.F. into dependence upon Hanoi, and Hanoi into dependence on China and Russia. This com-

promises not only the prospects for peace but also the independence of any post-peace action by the N.L.F. Thus our military action tends to create the very Communist monolith we entered the war to avoid.

We should take extraordinary diplomatic steps to get fruitful negotiations. The President should appoint, with the advice of the Senate, a special cabinet-level official of great stature to negotiate with the N.L.F. and Hanoi. The sole responsibility of this official should be termination of the war. He should be served by his own staff, free from bureaucratic interference and the burden of past positions. With a reasoned military strategy and the full energies of our Government devoted to diplomacy, I am convinced that the Viet Cong and the North Vietnamese will negotiate.

The following steps should be taken promptly:

1. All bombing of North Vietnam should be stopped, not just because the Communists want it stopped, but because strategic bombing of the North is counter-productive. In a bombing termination, strategy and morality coincide. It should be undertaken immediately.

2. Extraordinary and energetic measures should be taken by our Government to enter into negotiations with the N.L.F. and Hanoi governments. We have contacted these governments in the past. These contacts should be reopened. Negotiations should be handled by a specially appointed cabinet-level official, operating with the full confidence of the President.

3. We should develop and put into operation a plan for the de-escalation of our forces, to be based on the enclave strategy outlined earlier.

Although I think that by now the American people realize that we are on an unwise course, I anticipate bitter criticism of any plan that involves a United States phase-out from Vietnam. Harsh words will come from congressional leaders who have advocated increased bombing. Some in veterans' organizations and the military will find it difficult to accept what appears to them to be not "victory" but "appeasement." And the far left will decry as "imperialism" any safeguards necessary for ourselves and our South Vietnamese friends.

A settlement will be emotionally difficult, taxing in time, wearing on our wisdom and patience. But a settlement is imperative in our own self-interest. Its alternative is continued escalation until we oppose the forces of Red China in World War III.

With Vietnam we have grown up into tragedy. We cannot end our involvement without some cost, some pain. A mature nation can face such realities and take actions that, while they are less than some want, nevertheless lead away from the risk of self-destruction. I am sure we can.

Mr. PELL. What I would add, though, is that I think there should be aggressive patrols around any area where our troops might be withdrawn in order to keep enemy weapons at a distance. And I think if the enemy once discovered we were willing to stay until the cows came home in defendable areas, with the expenditure of far less of our blood and money than today—the public could bear with it and we could continue it as long as necessary, as the price of our greatness. Then, the tables would be turned and it would be to the advantage of the enemy to try to negotiate us out of where we were. I believe we would soon find, too, if we were willing to follow this, do that, at a bearable cost, that the war before now would have been concluded.

A SENATOR'S DUTY TO DISSENT

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I wish to address the Senate today only briefly.

Later I shall engage more fully in the debate which has today, I believe, been initiated.

I should like to address a few remarks today to the subject of a Senator's duty to dissent.

Mr. President, it was in 1775 that Patrick Henry spoke before the Second Revolutionary Convention of Virginia at Williamsburg. It was in that speech that he uttered his famous plea for liberty or for death; but it is not that phrase to which I wish to make reference. I shall quote him more in point, I believe, on the question before the Senate. He said:

No man thinks more highly than I do of the patriotism, as well as abilities, of the very worthy gentlemen who have just addressed the House. But different men often see the same subject in different lights; and, therefore, I hope that it will not be thought disrespectful to those gentlemen, if, entertaining as I do, opinions of a character very opposite to theirs, I shall speak forth my sentiments freely and without reserve. This is not time for ceremony. The question before the House is one of awful moment to this country. For my own part I consider it as nothing less than a question of freedom or slavery; and in proportion to the magnitude of the subject ought to be the freedom of the debate. It is only in this way that we can hope to arrive at truth, and fulfil the great responsibility which we hold to God and our country. Should I keep back my opinions at such a time, through fear of giving offence, I should consider myself as guilty of treason towards my country, and of an act of disloyalty towards the majesty of heaven, which I revere above all earthly kings.

Mr. President, the dilemma Patrick Henry faced continues to confront the elected Representatives of the American people. Indeed, it confronted yesterday a candidate for the Democratic nomination for President. It confronts, and has steadily during recent months confronted, Members of the U.S. Senate. Insinuations have been frequent, and from the highest sources as well as from our colleagues in the Senate, that the expression of dissent would in some way aid or encourage the enemy.

This dilemma is as old as our Republic. The dilemma is whether, in certain situations, patriotism demands that men hold their tongues or speak their minds; whether the true patriot, who questions the course of action his government is taking, should remain silent and thus by his silence give his assent to the conduct and the policies of his government or should, instead, in voice challenge the wisdom of his leaders.

I believe, Mr. President, that a U.S. Senator not only has a right to express his dissent but a duty to do so, and the greater the cause, the greater the duty. It will be a lamentable day, indeed, when U.S. Senators refrain from criticizing or questioning the policies of our Government because of the fear that to do so will bring upon them the opprobrium, the accusation, the insinuation or the question of being unpatriotic. This shall not be. And, as Patrick Henry noted, the more important the subject, the freer—the more outspoken—should be the debate.

I do not think that anyone would deny that the war in Vietnam involves the most important question our Nation faces today. It is the most important

question upon which we can engage in debate. Witness the fact that today, even though the Senate is considering a measure which would initiate one of the most far-reaching social reforms in the history of our Republic, yet, when the subject of the war in Vietnam is broached, the other subject is forgotten, and for three or four hours now debate has flared, I hope it will continue to flare for days to come.

Fortunately, the Secretary of State, the Honorable Dean Rusk, has agreed to testify in public on the policies of the U.S. Government. That testimony will begin next Monday, and I hope that will be but a beginning of a reassessment and a probing examination of this policy described by the distinguished majority leader earlier today as one which threatens to destroy not only the nation we profess to be saving, but also the United States, both abroad and at home.

To what graver question can the Senate address itself? Let us proceed with a careful examination. And let us hope that we can contribute to the making of wise decisions by the President of the United States, for whom I have the deepest of sympathy in the great burden he bears. He, too, has been misled—perhaps not intentionally, but by the erroneous estimates of those who told him in the beginning that once American forces were committed, the conflict would soon end.

I am told that some said within months, if not within weeks; this was an erroneous estimate. What influence it had upon the President's decision, I do not know. But, be that as it may, let me ask one question, and with this question I close.

What would be the price of unanimity in the present situation? What would be the consequence if all Senators sealed their lips, silenced their voices? Suppose there were no dissenting voices on a policy which has already led us to tragedy? How do we achieve unanimity in this country? In this distraught circumstance, I do not know.

The senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] challenges the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee to introduce a resolution to withdraw from Vietnam. I doubt if that would bring unanimity any more than a resolution to declare war upon North Vietnam would bring unanimity.

Oh, if a declaration of war should pass, it would silence the dissent of this Senator. However, these constitutional processes that invoke powers and patriotism and legal sanction have not been used. We have been led into a war by inadvertence, step by step, backward.

Only a few Sundays ago on television, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State indicated that 2 years ago they did not foresee the size of the present commitment. I do not have their exact words in mind. In a later speech, I will quote them exactly.

Senators, too, have erred. I do not excuse myself. There has been enough error for all to share.

Yes, Mr. President, this country is seriously in need of reassessment, re-examination, and reappraisal. The chairman of the Foreign Relations Commit-

tee has said earlier that such reappraisal and such reexamination is underway in the executive branch of the Government now. I hope it is. And I believe that to be true. But the elected representatives of the American people need to be part of that reassessment and that reappraisal. And, to the extent that the security of the country will permit, the American people whose sons are dying have a right to know.

I am therefore pleased that we will begin a public hearing next Monday.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, the Senator asked a very good question. What would happen if the Senate ceased to speak out its mind on this question?

I wonder if we cannot go back into ancient history and look at what happened to Rome and its Senate following Rome's most complete victory, the one at Carthage.

Mr. GORE. The Senator makes a pertinent historical allusion. Let us hope and pray that the great United States, blessed as it is with unequalled powers, resources, glory, and resolution of its people, will not suffer the fate that Rome suffered, nor that it will visit upon other countries and other cities the tragedy of Carthage.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, this debate has essentially been a magnificent effort to reaffirm and recapture the responsibility of the U.S. Senate in the democratic process and in accord with the provisions of the Constitution. And as such, I pay tribute to the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee who has raised the issue and to all other Senators who have spoken so eloquently today on the subject of the war in Southeast Asia and of the Senate's responsibility in the matter.

I do not at this late hour wish to take the time to express my views on the war, which are well known and were expressed for the first time in a full-length speech on the floor of the Senate 4 years ago this very week.

I only say that it has become increasingly clear that those of us who foresaw an ever-deepening disaster by reason of our becoming involved in a ground war on the continent of Asia are gratified that at long last there is a realization of the enormity of the catastrophe into which our national policies are steadily plunging our Nation.

I am confident and hopeful that this debate, initiated by the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, who has shown great leadership in trying to call the attention of the Nation to the errors our foreign policy has been committing, will lead to its reappraisal and to participation by the Senate in future decisions based on frank collaboration with the executive branch, and avoid thereby further descent into the ever-deepening chaos into which we are now headed.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, a moment ago I made reference to two persons who had the foresight, or, in the words of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], the intuition—which is a very good word in my opinion—to foresee the dangers involved at the time of the consideration and passage of the so-called Tonkin Gulf joint resolution.

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], together with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], were the only two Members of the Senate who had the foresight to object to that procedure. I congratulate the Senator from Alaska for his foresight.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I say with great humility that I think if the facts which were brought out in the recent hearings of the Foreign Relations Committee by the pertinent questions by the chairman [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and by the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] had been known at the time of the consideration of the Tonkin Gulf joint resolution, it never would have been approved by the Senate, and our people and the people of Southeast Asia would have been spared the tragedy which has followed.

INTERFERENCE WITH CIVIL RIGHTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2516) to prescribe penalties for certain acts of violence or intimidation and for other purposes.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 565, and ask that it be stated by the clerk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The bill clerk read the amendment, as follows:

On page 3, line 14, between the semicolon and the word "or," insert the following:

"(F) pursuing his employment by any department or agency of the United States or by any private employer engaged in interstate commerce or any activity affecting interstate commerce, or traveling to or from the place of his employment or any other place for such purpose;"

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, earlier today, I obtained unanimous consent to modify my amendment No. 599 to incorporate the language of the amendment of the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] which was adopted by the Senate.

I also ask unanimous consent that my amendment be modified with respect to the coverage of dependents on page 10 of my amendment, so that it will read "judicially determined dependent"; and that my amendment be further modified so that units over and above four-family units which are not federally assisted will be subject to the provisions of section 204, as long as they are required to operate under the authority of a State or local government. I ask unanimous consent for that, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I now send to the desk a redrafted amendment to incorporate what has been agreed upon. I ask that it be printed as a star print, amendment No. 599, so that it will be on Senators' desks tomorrow morning. Also, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like the RECORD to show that the Senator from Iowa has discussed his request with the majority leader, with me, and with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], and I know of no objection to the request.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, let me add a footnote to that.

If we do not do this, the Members of the Senate will be very confused about the amendment, I believe this will help the Senate to know what it wants to do on my amendment, and I believe it will also help the press to understand what has been done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Iowa? The Chair hears none, and it is ordered.

The redrafted amendment is as follows:

On page 8, line 4, strike "(a)" and "subsection"; and on line 5, strike "(b) and".

Strike all on page 9 after line 4, all of page 10, and lines 1 and 2 on page 11 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(2) After December 31, 1968, to all dwellings covered by paragraph (1) and to all other dwellings where the prospective buyer or renter is a member or honorably discharged member of the Armed Forces of the United States, or surviving widow or surviving parent, or judicially determined dependent of a member of the Armed Forces. The Congress finds that it is necessary and proper to the health and welfare of the Armed Forces of the United States that discrimination by reason of race, color, religion, or national origin be prohibited in the sale or rental of housing as hereinabove provided.

"(3) Except as provided in subsection (2) above, the prohibitions against discrimination in the sale or rental of housing set forth in subsections 204(a), (b), (d), and (e) shall not apply in the case of any single-family house sold or rented by an owner: *Provided*, That such private individual owner does not own more than three such single-family houses at any one time: *Provided further*, That in the case of the sale of any such single-family house by a private individual owner not residing in such house at the time of such sale or who was not the most recent resident of such house prior to such sale, the exemption granted by this subsection shall apply only with respect to one such sale within any twenty-four month period: *Provided further*, That such bona fide private individual owner does not own any interest in, nor is there owned or reserved on his behalf, under any express or voluntary agreement, title to or any right to all or a portion of the proceeds from the sale or rental of, more than three such single-family houses at any one time. Nor, except as provided in subsection (2) above, shall such prohibitions apply in the case of the sale or rental by an owner of rooms or units in dwellings containing living quarters occupied or intended to be occupied by no more than four families living independently of each other: *Provided*, That in the case of dwellings covered by subsection (1) the owner occupies one of such living quarters as his residence. Nor, except as pro-

vided in subsection (2) above, shall such prohibitions apply in the case of the sale or rental of rooms or units in a dwelling containing living quarters occupied or intended to be occupied by more than four families living independently of each other when said dwelling is not required to be authorized to operate under a state or local law: *Provided*, That this exception shall not apply in the case of dwellings covered by subsection (1)."

On page 11, line 5, strike "section 203(b) and" and insert in lieu thereof the word "section".

On page 12, add the following after line 7: "(e) After December 31, 1968, in the case of all dwellings other than those made applicable by section 203(1), except as exempted by section 207, it shall be unlawful to make, print, or publish, or cause to be made, printed, or published any notice, statement, or advertisement affecting interstate commerce with respect to the sale or rental of a dwelling that indicates any preference, limitation, or discrimination based on race, color, religion, or national origin, or an intention to make any such preference, limitation, or discrimination."

On page 12, strike all after the word "given" on line 25 and on page 13 all of lines 1 and 2 and insert in lieu thereof a period (.) .

On page 13, strike lines 5 through 12 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 206. Upon the date of enactment of this Act with respect to all dwellings described in section 203, and after December 31, 1968, with respect to all other dwellings, it shall be unlawful—

"(a) for any person licensed as a real estate broker or salesman, attorney, or auctioneer, or any agent or representative by power of attorney, or any person acting under court order, deed of trust, or will—

"(1) to refuse to sell or rent, negotiate for the sale or rental of, or otherwise make unavailable or deny, a dwelling to any person because of race, color, religion, or national origin;

"(2) to discriminate against any person in the terms, conditions, or privileges of sale or rental of a dwelling, or in the provision of services or facilities in connection therewith, because of race, color, religion, or national origin;

"(3) to make, print, or publish, or cause to be made, printed, or published any oral or written notice, statement, or advertisement, with respect to the sale or rental of a dwelling that indicates any preference, limitation, or discrimination based on race, color, religion, or national origin, or an intention to make any such preference, limitation, or discrimination; or

"(4) to represent to any person because of race, color, religion, or national origin that any dwelling is not available for inspection, sale, or rental when such dwelling is in fact so available.

"(b) to induce or attempt to induce any person to sell or rent any dwelling by representations regarding the entry or prospective entry into the neighborhood of a person or persons of a particular race, color, religion, or national origin.

"(c) to deny any person access to or membership or participation in any multiple-listing service, real estate brokers' organization or other service, organization, or facility relating to the business of selling or renting dwellings, or to discriminate against him in the terms or conditions of such access, membership, or participation, on account of race, color, religion, or national origin."

that statements made therein be limited to 3 minutes. I ask unanimous consent, further, that the time not be charged against either side on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON REAPPORTIONMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriations of various departments, for the fiscal year 1968, had been reapportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriations; to the Committee on Appropriations.

OPPOSITION OF JUDICIAL CONFERENCE TO S. 916

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, conveying the opposition of the Judicial Conference to S. 916, which would remove from court control the supervision of persons on probation (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITION

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a resolution of the Senate of the State of Maryland, expressing support of U.S. Armed Forces personnel stationed throughout the world, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, as follows:

SENATE RESOLUTION 42

Senate resolution requesting the Senate to express support of U.S. Armed Forces personnel stationed throughout the world

Whereas, There are over one million American Armed Forces Personnel stationed on the frontiers of freedom throughout the world; and

Whereas, The various duty stations of our fighting men range from the steamy jungles of Southeast Asia to lonely research outposts deep in frozen Antarctica; and

Whereas, These are most difficult times in international relations requiring an inordinately high level of sacrifice from our fighting men and their families; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of Maryland, That it is the sense of this body to express their support of United States Armed Forces personnel stationed throughout the world; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this Resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, and to the Maryland Delegation in Congress.

By the Senate, February 19, 1968.

Read and adopted.

By order, J. Waters Parrish, Secretary.

WILLIAM S. JAMES,

President of the Senate.

J. WATERS PARRISH,
Secretary of the Senate.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. BARTLETT, from the Committee on Commerce, without amendment:

S. 3030. A bill to amend section 3 of the act of November 2, 1966, relating to the development by the Secretary of the Interior of fish protein concentrate (Rept. No. 1013).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 3109. A bill for the relief of Ann Su Gibson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 3110. A bill to amend section 1811 of title 38, United States Code, so as to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to make direct loans for housing under such section in certain urban areas whenever private capital is not available for such purpose; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 3111. A bill to amend chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code, in order to provide counseling and technical assistance to veterans eligible for home and business loans under such chapter, and for other purposes; and

S. 3112. A bill to amend section 1675 of title 38, United States Code, in order to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to waive the requirement that a course of training must have been in operation for 2 years or more by an educational institution before such course may be approved for the enrollment of eligible veterans; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. INOUE:

S. 3113. A bill for the relief of Wong Kwai Fat; and

S. 3114. A bill for the relief of Yu Hsiao Kun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRIS (for himself and Mr. MONRONEY):

S. 3115. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to establish the Robert S. Kerr Memorial Arboretum and Nature Center in the Ouachita National Forest in Oklahoma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. HARRIS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana:

S. 3116. A bill to authorize a high-level bridge over Bayou Barataria, La.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana (for himself and Mr. ELLENDER):

S. 3117. A bill authorizing construction of certain navigation channel improvements on the Mississippi River-Gulf outlet channel in Louisiana; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 3115—INTRODUCTION OF BILL TO ESTABLISH THE ROBERT S. KERR MEMORIAL ARBORETUM AND NATURE CENTER, OKLAHOMA

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I introduce for myself and my distinguished colleague, Mr. MONRONEY, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to establish the Robert S. Kerr Memorial Arboretum and Nature Center in the Ouachita National Forest in southeastern Oklahoma.

Mr. President, the proposed Robert S. Kerr Memorial Arboretum and Nature Center is a major facility in the recreation complex being developed in the Ouachita National Forest in LeFlore County, Okla. Access to this scenic area of southeastern Oklahoma and southwestern Arkansas is over the 55-mile-long Talimena Scenic Drive. The Tali-

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a brief period for the transaction of routine morning business and

mena Scenic Drive is a public land highway fully financed and soon to be completed. The drive is a new forest recreation highway authorized and constructed to further the development of the full potential of these public lands in order to help meet the ever-increasing demand for a better understanding of nature and for some outdoor recreation opportunities.

As you know, Mr. President, the late Senator Robert S. Kerr, of Oklahoma, throughout his public service career promoted the full development and utilization of our Nation's natural resources. He once said:

A nation preserved as God gave it to us, what more can man ask from life.

The establishment of a memorial arboretum as proposed in the legislation I introduce today will certainly preserve a portion of southeastern Oklahoma as God gave it to us and will make it more accessible to the general public for a better understanding of nature and for better recreational opportunities.

There is a tremendous interest in and support of the proposed Robert S. Kerr Memorial Arboretum in both Oklahoma and Arkansas. Agencies of the two States have contributed substantially to the development of the project.

Local citizens and foundations have indicated their willingness to make substantial contributions to the development of the arboretum and the U.S. Forest Service has indicated a willingness to accept responsibility for the design, construction specifications and operation of the project.

Mr. President, there are at present no existing nature centers in mid-America. There is an urgent need in this area for the outdoor laboratories that will be provided by the Robert S. Kerr Memorial Arboretum and Nature Center. The estimated social and economic benefits of a center of this kind are: First, over 40,000 school-age children will use the facility as an educational center each year; second, yearly visits will total about 350,000; third, visitor dollars added to the local economy will amount to more than \$2,500,000 annually; fourth, direct returns to the arboretum will total about \$82,500 annually—25 cents entrance fee for those 12 years old and up.

A suitable site has been selected for the arboretum and nature center, located on a 350-acre tract of national forest land adjacent to the Talimena Scenic Drive, just east of U.S. Highway 259, in LeFlore County, Okla.

The total development plan required includes the building complex—office, amphitheater, classroom, display area, maintenance work center, and so forth—trails, roads, parking areas, complete landscaping, planting to show native vegetation, demonstration areas, exhibits, 30-acre impoundment, and picnic facilities.

The legislation I introduce here today is needed to authorize the project and to provide the U.S. Department of Agriculture, and the National Forest Service the authority to receive and expend private capital in the development of the arboretum. The construction and development of this project has high priority

in the total development of the Ouachita National Forest. The National Forest Service is responsible for all the recreational activities within the Ouachita National Forest and they have the professional competency required to complete this project as soon as adequate funds are made available.

This arboretum will certainly pay tribute to an outstanding American, the late Senator Robert S. Kerr, and the passage of this authorizing legislation certainly deserves the expeditious attention of the Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3115) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to establish the Robert S. Kerr Memorial Arboretum and Nature Center in the Ouachita National Forest in Oklahoma, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HARRIS (for himself and Mr. MONROE), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE 38, UNITED STATES CODE, TO INCREASE THE AMOUNT OF HOME LOAN GUARANTEE ENTITLEMENT—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENTS NOS. 601 AND 602

Mr. JAVITS submitted two amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 2937) to amend title 38 of the United States Code to increase the amount of home loan guarantee entitlement from \$7,500 to \$10,000, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and ordered to be printed.

VETERANS IN PUBLIC SERVICE ACT OF 1968—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 603

Mr. JAVITS submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 2910) to provide special encouragement to veterans to pursue a public service career in deprived areas, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and ordered to be printed.

ELIMINATION OF RESERVE REQUIREMENTS FOR FEDERAL RESERVE NOTES—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 604

Mr. TOWER (for himself, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, and Mr. DOMINICK) submitted an amendment, in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 2857) to eliminate the reserve requirements for Federal Reserve notes and for U.S. notes and Treasury notes of 1890, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, March 7, 1968, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 2419) to

amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, with respect to the development of cargo containing vessels, and for other purposes.

NEW BISHOP IN EASTERN MONTANA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, earlier this year the Most Reverend Eldon Bernard Schuster was installed as the new bishop of the eastern Montana Catholic diocese of Great Falls. Bishop Schuster is a native of Montana and will make a fine contribution in this sacred office.

His responsibilities are great, and I am convinced that no better choice could have been made. The eastern Montana diocese is the newer of the two in Montana. The administrative problems associated with a diocese this large are many, but I am confident that Bishop Schuster will have no difficulty in guiding his people in their spiritual needs.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a feature story highlighting Bishop Schuster's career, published in the Montana Catholic Register of January 24, 1968.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW BISHOP REARED IN RURAL MONTANA—HAS WEALTH OF DIOCESAN EXPERIENCE

The home of John F. and Leona Osborn Schuster was filled with joy March 10, 1911, in Calio, N. Dak., for God had given them a son whom they named Eldon Bernard.

It was less than a year later that the deeply religious couple and their young son moved to Glentana, Mont. Here, in this rural, northern Montana community, the future Fourth Bishop of the Diocese of Great Falls spent his boyhood.

There was work to do on the family farm as well as in the family store and, under his father's firm but loving direction, young Eldon performed his share of chores, learning the true value of labor.

But what is even more important was the piety of his devoted parents which provided him with love of God and Church and gave direction to his vocation.

His early schooling in religion, in addition to that received from his parents, was through the program of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine in which he has labored continuously ever since.

He completed his elementary school training in Glentana and entered high school in North Dakota. After his first year in North Dakota, he was enrolled in Glasgow High School.

Eldon Bernard Schuster was a good student but he did not limit his activities strictly to books. He participated in forensics, drama, music and was a member of the Glasgow Scotties track team.

On the day of his consecration—Dec. 21, 1961, as Auxiliary Bishop of the Eastern Montana diocese, Bishop Schuster said: "How can I thank God sufficiently for the pious and devoted parents He has given me! To them more than any other after God and Mary I owe my vocation and priesthood."

"My saintly father, who served my First Mass, has been much in my prayers and thoughts this day. That God has granted him a place of light and refreshment after his earthly labors is my daily prayer."

"Thanks be to God for sparing my dear mother to share in the happiness of this day. Her faith, intense loyalty to Mother Church, and zealous example have played no small

part in forming the ideals and inspiration of my priestly life."

Upon completion of high school in Glasgow, his desire was to be a priest. The then Eastern Montana Bishop, the Most Rev. Mathias C. Lenihan, whom he had known from boyhood, sent him to Loras college in Dubuque, Iowa.

Bishop Lenihan's faith in the youth was well placed and he completed his studies at Loras summa cum laude and was assigned by Bishop Edwin V. O'Hara to continue his studies for the priesthood at the Theological college in Washington, D.C., and he received a master's degree before leaving the college.

During his summer vacations from the seminary, he taught religious schools at Boyce, Avondale, Glentana, Peerless, White-tail, Outlook and Welliver—providing insight into many of the rural religious problems with which he was to become familiar in the far-flung diocese.

He became a subdeacon in 1936 while at Washington, D.C., and, May 27, 1937, was ordained a priest by Bishop O'Hara at St. Ann's Cathedral in Great Falls.

Father Eldon B. Schuster celebrated his first Solemn High Mass in the humble church of his home parish—Holy Family—in Glentana June 1, 1937.

Among his first assignments as a priest, Father Schuster was named editor of *The Register*, Eastern Montana Edition, a post he held until enrolling at Oxford university in England in 1938. He also was assistant diocesan spiritual director for the CYC.

His studies at Oxford were cut short when the university halted general classes at the outbreak of World War II.

On his return to Great Falls in September, 1939, Father Schuster was named assistant at St. Ann's Cathedral and an instructor at St. Mary's high school, later to be relocated and renamed Central Catholic high school.

In August, 1940, he was appointed vice chancellor of the diocese by the Most Rev. William J. Condon, who had been named Bishop of Great Falls a year earlier. Father Schuster also became secretary to Bishop Condon at the same time.

In 1943, he was named administrator of St. Ann's and during that year became moderator for the Diocesan Council of Catholic Women.

In 1946, Father Schuster was appointed by Bishop Condon as the first Diocesan Superintendent of Schools, a post he held, among others, until his most recent appointment as Bishop.

Following the school assignment, he was granted a leave of absence to study at St. Louis university where he completed his course requirements for a doctorate degree in education.

He was named chancellor of the diocese on his return from St. Louis, and served in this capacity for about two years. Additionally, Father Schuster had temporary assignments at the Immaculate Conception parish in Fort Benton, St. Joseph's hospital in Lewistown, and also carried out the responsibilities of the growing diocesan educational system.

As his responsibilities grew, so also did his religious stature. In August, 1949, it was announced that Father Schuster was to become a Domestic Prelate with the title of Right Reverend Monsignor. His investiture as Prelate was held Nov. 9, 1949, at St. Ann's Cathedral.

The following year Monsignor Schuster was again named administrator at the Cathedral and in 1952 he served as chairman of the CCD congress.

In 1953, a diocesan-wide drive for funds was launched as Eastern Montana prepared for the golden jubilee of the diocese, to be held in 1954. Monsignor Schuster was chairman of the fund drive and carried it to a successful conclusion.

The drive was a crucial one for the diocese and it was noted at the time that funds were needed to wipe out old parish debts, to build parish churches, schools, convents, rectories and generally improve parish property throughout eastern Montana.

With the completion of this task, Monsignor Schuster was named chairman of events surrounding the 1954 jubilee observance, one of the most extensive religious programs ever held in Montana.

For portions of 1953 and 1954, Monsignor Schuster was administrator of St. Joseph's parish in Great Falls, but returned to his full-time post as school superintendent in July of 1954.

During the next five years his religious and administrative duties continued to mount as the diocesan population increased. For two months, of 1959, however, he was given the opportunity to visit Rome and other historic and religious places in Europe.

In 1960, he was appointed pastor at Holy Family parish in Great Falls and supervised the building of expanded parish facilities there along with a new elementary school.

Earlier he had served in similar capacities during the building of St. Joseph's elementary school in West Great Falls, and during the construction of Central high school.

During this period, Monsignor Schuster was a trustee at the College of Great Falls, moderator for the Diocesan Council of Catholic Women and Diocesan Chaplain for the Catholic Boy Scouts.

Thus his activities gave him an insight into virtually every facet of Catholic life in the diocese and it was with this background in mind and with high recommendation from Bishop Condon, that Pope John XXIII named Monsignor Schuster as Titular Bishop of Amblada and Auxiliary Bishop of Great Falls. He was consecrated Dec. 21, 1961, the first auxiliary ever to serve in Montana.

In 1963, with Bishop Condon, he attended the opening sessions of the historic Second Vatican Council in Rome and during the Council had the signal honor of an audience with Pope John.

In May, 1963, 26 years after he was ordained to the priesthood, he presided at his first ordination ceremony, conferring the dignity of the priesthood on Father Robert Bofko.

On the death of Bishop Condon Aug. 17, 1967, Bishop Schuster was named administrator of the diocese and acted in this capacity until the announcement Dec. 6, 1967, naming him the fourth Bishop of the eastern Montana diocese.

Announcement of the Pope's directive naming him Bishop, was made in Washington, D.C., by the Papal Delegate to the United States, Archbishop Luigi Raimondi. Archbishop Raimondi presided, Jan. 23, 1968, during the installation Mass for Bishop Schuster.

ANNIVERSARY OF BIRTH OF THOMAS MASARYK

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, today, March 7, is the anniversary of the birth in 1850 of Thomas Garrigue Masaryk, the philosopher, Czechoslovak patriot and first President of Czechoslovakia, which was founded 50 years ago.

Americans of many national origins join on this day in tribute to this great humanitarian who led the Czechs and Slovaks in the years of World War I, who founded the Czechoslovak Republic and served as its first President, from 1918 to 1935. When he retired, the title, President-Liberator, was conferred upon him.

While Masaryk will be honored around the world this day, Mr. President, it is a cruel irony that in his own country it is

forbidden to celebrate the memory and greatness of the man of whom biographer Emil Ludwig wrote:

Abraham Lincoln is about the only historical figure with whom I can compare him.

Eighteen years ago this week, on the occasion of the centennial of Masaryk's birth, it was my privilege to speak in Omaha, Nebr., at a ceremony commemorating this event. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that those remarks, entitled, "Masaryk, Servant of the People," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MASARYK—SERVANT OF THE PEOPLE

(Remarks of ROMAN L. HRUSKA at observation of centennial of Masaryk's birth, in Sokol Auditorium, Omaha, on March 12, 1950)

There are many reasons why we admire and honor Thomas Garrigue Masaryk. The fact that he married an American—a very accomplished and brilliant woman—has always appealed to us. There naturally followed a deep admiration for the country of his wife and a faithful study of its language and history, so that Masaryk's knowledge of our country became wide and accurate. He visited in America four times between 1878 and 1918.

Again, when it came time for him to proclaim the independence of his native land, he did so in Independence Hall in Philadelphia. By that time he had gained many personal friends among Americans, not the least of whom was Woodrow Wilson, a fellow-professor, a fellow-philosopher, and later a fellow-president.

Another thing which makes him stand so well with us is the fact that he won so high a place in the world and in the judgments of men even though he was of lowly origin and had so many obstacles to overcome. His parents were serfs, you know; slaves. His father was a coachman, his mother a cook, on an imperial estate. He himself was apprenticed to the village blacksmith and learned that trade, a fact of which he remained proud throughout his life. From such a beginning he rose to what author John Gunther called "the finest intellect of the century." He performed wonders as a leader of men, as an educator, and as a statesman, retaining all the while full integrity and self-respect, as well as the respect of all who knew him.

His inborn quality of character and personality first asserted itself in a larger way when he started teaching. He refused to adopt the traditional professorial officiousness and stand-offishness of his time. He treated his pupils openly and squarely, analyzed their problems frankly and fearlessly. This seems ordinary and expected now, but was revolutionary in 1880. It was not long before he became the trusted leader of the youth of his universities and of his country, and not much later that he was the trusted leader of central Europe. His writings were in philosophy and government. They extended over almost half a century, starting in 1881.

But he did not limit himself to the theoretical and academic. He served a total of 12 years in the Austrian Parliament, being first elected in 1891. He took an active part in its deliberations, contending for political improvement of his country and vigorously advocating political autonomy for it. It was as a member of parliament and as a journalist that he became widely and favorably known for his courage and his abilities as a leader and organizer. Three outstanding instances of this are of record as noteworthy.

The first had to do with the "Königshofer Manuscript", which was supposed to have

mediaeval origin, although not discovered until about 1800 in the steeple of an old village church. Certain claims of Czech national destiny and history were made on the basis of this document, and it was highly hailed in the program of nationalistic revival then so current. Masaryk, after a thorough study of the document, subscribed to the position that it was a forgery. He was sympathetic to nationalist revival, but was convinced that it should rest on true and firm ground rather than upon fabrication. His declaration of the forgery was a severe blow to the pride of his countrymen. He was severely ostracized, and completely disowned by many as a traitor. Later years, however, completely bore out the validity of his judgment.

The second example was his defense of a Jewish youth named Hilsner who was charged before the courts of a ritual murder. Masaryk never met the accused, never came to know him, but it was important to him that the man had been wrongfully accused and was in danger of being found guilty as a result of false trial and hysteria. Masaryk was accused of having been bribed by Rothschild, his resignation from the faculty was demanded by his fellow professors, the clergy, and public officials; his children were insulted and maltreated on the streets. The number of friends who stayed with him as he held his ground was small, but the ground on which they stood was solid.

The third example was in Parliament, when 53 Croats and Serbs were charged with high treason after the annexation of Bosnia by the Austrian government—one of the fateful steps which precipitated World War I. The prosecution based much of its case on certain documents which Masaryk was able to prove not only were forged, but were the result of connivance of members of the Austrian cabinet. The prosecution failed, Masaryk's career in Parliament was ruined, but his position in central Europe and in the world became entrenched. He became regarded as a stalwart champion of truth and justice for their own sake. He was recognized as a power and personality of versatile talents and knowledge, and unquestioned integrity. He made friends the world over, an asset that became highly useful to him in after years.

Thus, at the age of 60 years, he had gained worldwide standing as a scholar, philosopher, educator, and statesman. It was about that time he was the honored guest at a testimonial dinner, given with the idea that he had reached the apex of his career! Four years later—at the age of 64—he flung all of his strength, energies, and vitality into the battle for his country's independence and freedom. There followed four years of intrigue, plotting, espionage, conspiracies and travels that took him back and forth across Europe, and around the world. Without government treasure of any kind, without the prestige of a country to back him up, he accomplished wonders with only a few loyal friends in exile with him. Implicit faith of his countrymen at home and abroad was his. But the chief factor throughout was his sheer force of personality, his untiring efforts, and his unbounded faith. And if he were here to suggest it, he would add at this point that he also had Eduard Benes, without whom the task and success would not have been achieved.

Masaryk conceived and led one of the most amazing mass expeditions of modern times, when the Czechoslovak legions traveled 10,000 miles across Siberia to the Pacific to join the fighting on the Franco-German front. He had built up about 40,000 troops from among Czechoslovak nationals, many being deserters from the Austrian army. They had assembled in southern Russia, with the idea of sending them to the western front. But the fall of the Czar and unsettled conditions in Russia made it impossible except to go around the world—and that is

what they did, displaying a fortitude and a daring which captured the imagination of the world!

There are many things in this heroic life which would readily lead us to hail it as a great one. A close and sentimental tie with Czechoslovakia, such as that held by its natives or their descendants, might tend to a partial or emotional judgment. What then is the appraisal of those who have no born or inherited sympathies in that direction?

John Gunther, journalist and author of wide experience, wrote in his book "Inside Europe":

"Masaryk—what grandeur the name connotes! The son of a serf who created a nation; the blacksmith boy who grew to have 'the finest intellect of the century'; the pacifist who organized an army that performed a feat unparalleled in military annals—the Czechoslovak legions who marched across Siberia to the Pacific; the philosopher who became a statesman in spite of himself; the living father of a state who is also its simplest citizen; an unchallengeably firm democrat who in the debacle of the modern world still believed in the rule by tolerance; the man who more than any other smashed the old Austro-Hungarian empire so that Czechoslovakia, a free Republic, rose from its ruins—the stables, strongest, and most prosperous of the succession states."

This is the considered statement of a man who by profession and training would normally tend to be cynical, but who instead is enthusiastic.

Emil Ludwig, the eminent and distinguished biographer, is widely known for his biographies of Napoleon and Bismarck and his works on many other great men in history. "Servant of the People" which is the title chosen for my part in the afternoon's program, is Ludwig's classification of Masaryk, as distinguished from "Ruler of the People" and other designations which Ludwig sometimes used. He wrote:

"Abraham Lincoln is about the only historical figure with whom I can compare him (Masaryk). Both rose to presidential rank from the common people. . . . Each worked his way upwards from the ranks of the people through consciousness of moral rectitude which no opponent ever called into question. . . ."

Does Masaryk really merit the high place we give him as a brilliant mind and intellect? Ludwig thought so. He wrote that Masaryk's acquaintance with ethnic, statistical, historical and cultural questions was infinitely superior to that of the Ministers of the Allies interested in post World War I peace. He wrote:

"In contrast to those English Ministers who knew no language but their own and had never traveled, and (in contrast with) the French who are an incurably stay-at-home people, and the Americans who see Europe in the bulk as if it were a mere antheap of nations, (in contrast with all these) stood this single individual who knew the national statistics and data, the customs and literature, the general character and institutions of the various nations and could elucidate them all in their respective languages!"

Over and above all this, said Ludwig, stood his high personal qualities and experience which served to persuade men to listen to what he had to say and to finally bring them around to his point of view.

"The confidence which he universally instilled, his journalistic experience, his absolute integrity and the entire absence of any spirit of ambition or self-seeking—all these imponderabilia constituted a leading factor of his success. . . ."

Sometimes we are tempted to speculate as to the course of affairs leading to the Treaty of Versailles had Masaryk been allowed to participate in the deliberations. And similarly, if Eduard Benes had been in attend-

ance 20 years later in pre-Munich conferences. Is it not reasonable to believe that in both instances, the true implications and import of many proposals would have been made clear in ample time so that many of the mistakes made could have been avoided?

CIVIL DISORDER REPORT A WHITE-WASH

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a column entitled "Civil Disorder Report a Whitewash," written by James J. Kilpatrick, and published in the Washington Evening Star of today.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CIVIL DISORDER REPORT A WHITEWASH (By James J. Kilpatrick)

Forgive me if I come as late as Lyndon Johnson to the Report of the President's Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders. The report ran to six volumes and 250,000 words. There was some obligation to plow through most of it before sounding off.

The report makes some excellent points. It is especially effective in its analysis of Negro housing problems, and it rightly points to the gross errors of urban renewal as a key factor in a bad situation. The commission's harsh indictment of police and Guardsmen is fully deserved, and the report's warning against "over-reaction" this summer is immensely useful. Several recommendations for improved communication between black and white make obvious sense.

When that has been said, it remains to be said that the report, viewed as a whole, is woefully unbalanced. Most of the major recommendations are unrealistic; some of them—for example, that the minimum wage be further increased—are misguided. And sad to say, in its long review of the 1967 riots, the commission has come up with the greatest whitewash job since Tom Sawyer laid aside his brush.

From this report, it appears that everyone was to blame for the riots—everyone, that is, but the rioters themselves. It is unbelievable. They appear in the narrative portions of the report as faceless agents of a passive mood: Rocks were hurled, bottles were thrown. Elsewhere, the report falls into sociological thumb-sucking: Society had failed to teach the rioters how to read, so they looted TV sets instead. At every point, the commission's tendency is to rationalize, to excuse, to defend.

Government programs were to blame; these did not reach the people. Judges were to blame; they did not protect the looters' constitutional rights. Police were to blame; they were disrespectful. The press was to blame; it failed to understand. Above all, "white racism is essentially responsible" for the ghetto conditions that provoked the fearful violence.

It is thus "white racism" that is responsible for what the commission terms its basic conclusion, that "our nation is moving toward two societies, one black, one white—separate and unequal." This basic conclusion is basically false. For the past 30 years, our nation has not been moving toward a separate society, but away from it; and if this movement toward an integrated, multiracial society recently has been slowed, it is at least partly because of the "black racism" that manifests itself in a bloody cry for apartheid in reverse: "Kill Whites!"

You would catch no hint of this from the commission's report. When the commission speaks to the black racists, it speaks in the barest murmur of disapproval. They pro-

vided "an ugly background noise." The advocates of black power "unconsciously function as an accommodation to white racism." That is about the size of it.

The Negro, it is said, wants to walk alone. Splendid. But what is the commission's answer? It is to recommend new crutches. Welfare recipients are aggrieved by regulations which operate "to remind recipients that they are considered untrustworthy, promiscuous and lazy." It is an understandable grievance. What does the commission propose? It proposes a guaranteed annual income, higher rent supplements, make-work jobs, and a proliferation of easier handouts.

Of the Negro's responsibility for his own destiny there is scarcely a word. It is someone else's responsibility—private industry, public institutions, mostly the federal government. Most of the answers are to come from outside the ghetto, from builders, bankers, planners, lawmakers. The commission avoided price tags, but most estimates are that the federal proposals alone would cost \$150 billion over the next five years. Where is the money coming from? Who could spend it wisely? Would the recommended programs change white attitudes—or black?

God knows white society has its faults, and blind racial prejudice is among them. But it is an enormous disservice for this prestigious commission to proclaim that the ghetto's miseries are all the white man's doing. When one inquires why the city is burning, it ought not to be amiss to direct a few questions at the man with the torch in his hand.

PROPOSAL TO EUROPEANIZE NATO

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, in May of 1966, at the request of the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I visited Western Europe and talked with government leaders and knowledgeable observers in France, Germany, Belgium, and the United Kingdom. In the report I issued at the conclusion of my trip, entitled "Europe Today," I made a number of recommendations including suggesting that a number of specific steps be taken to Europeanize NATO.

One of the steps that I suggested was moving the military committee out of the Pentagon and relocating it in Europe in close proximity to SHAPE and the North Atlantic Council. I am happy to say that this action has been taken and that the military committee is now located in Brussels. Another step that I suggested was appointing a European general to serve as NATO's Supreme Allied Commander, provided that a command arrangement was maintained which would leave control of nuclear weapons in the hands of the President of the United States. That step, unhappily in my view, has not yet been taken.

Mr. C. L. Sulzberger, the distinguished New York Times columnist, has written a most interesting column on the subject of appointing a European to be the Supreme Allied Commander. Mr. Sulzberger has echoed my recommendation that NATO's next Supreme Commander be a European and has suggested, specifically, that he be British. In his column, he also reported the views of General Norstad, a former NATO Supreme Commander, on the subject of appointing a European to this position. It is General Norstad's view, as reported by Mr. Sulzberger, that perhaps an American Secretary General of NATO might be traded for the Supreme Commander's spot

which would result in NATO assuming a less American look.

I ask unanimous consent that the article, entitled "Foreign Affairs: An Alliance Package," written by C. L. Sulzberger, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 18, 1968]

FOREIGN AFFAIRS: ALLIANCE PACKAGE

(By C. L. Sulzberger)

LONDON.—It is highly desirable that NATO's next Supreme Commander should be British, provided that adequate assurances are given by the United States of its intention to continue a military presence in Europe betokening an ultimate nuclear guarantee.

The idea of giving the alliance its first non-American commander should be examined now. Otherwise, the moment for change will find everyone unprepared. General Lemnitzer, NATO's top officer, will be seventy next year. He has held the post since 1963 and obviously must soon be replaced.

THE END OF ERA

The era of glamorous World War II heroes will then end. He is the last of a famous generation that started at SHAPE headquarters with Eisenhower. Now a new phase inevitably begins. Britain's shrinking forces are well supplied with tactful, diplomatic senior officers who have served around the world.

I broached this subject tentatively in a column Jan. 24 which provoked an interested response from Gen. Lauris Norstad who, while he commanded NATO, was described by Alastair Buchan, the outstanding British military analyst, as "undoubtedly the most trusted figure in Western Europe."

On Feb. 6 Norstad wrote Walden Moore, director of the Declaration of Atlantic Unity: "On the specific idea of a European Supreme Commander, I commented that I thought this idea was now, as always, a possibility provided (a) that NATO would solve the difficult problem of control of the nuclear weapons available to it and (b) the Europeans could agree among themselves on the nation to provide the Supreme Commander and on the individual himself. . . .

"By process of elimination, the European Supreme Commander would almost have to be British and [I] expressed the hope that the U.K. had some top military figures from the present group who would have the stature needed for the job or could acquire it quickly."

Norstad concluded that these conditions haven't yet been met and it is therefore likely "an American will remain in the Supreme Commander's position by election of our European allies unless we can establish an American individual in the political area as a guarantor of full U.S. participation and commitment to NATO. Perhaps an American Secretary General might be traded for the Supreme Commander spot."

The latter suggestion is wise. The two crucial problems that must be solved are reassurance on continued U.S. support and nuclear protection. If both questions are adequately answered, there is much to be said for a switch in the nationalities of alliance leadership.

Secretary General Manlio Brosio, NATO's civilian boss, will be ready to step down at approximately the same time as Lemnitzer. Brosio, a distinguished Italian diplomat, became Secretary General in 1964 and is now over seventy.

It is thus convenient to contemplate the kind of switch Norstad suggests but the groundwork must be carefully prepared. Next spring it becomes legally possible for members to announce their intention of denounc-

ing the alliance and it is not known whether France will avail itself of the right.

PAST PRACTICE

In the past it has been custom to almost automatically request the U.S. President to nominate a new military commander and each selection has been accepted without demur. It would be necessary for the partners to agree in advance of Lemnitzer's retirement that a European military chief is desirable—and it is obvious only an English officer would be acceptable at this juncture.

At the same time the U.S.A. should repeat its promise to keep forces in Europe and to accord the whole alliance area its total protection. Such a statement might be made at the time an American was offered as the next commander's deputy. This would assure retention of the nuclear umbrella without violating any Congressional restrictions.

To add weight to its NATO policy, Washington might let it be known that for the first time it would be willing to offer a distinguished American candidate for Secretary General when Brosio goes. Surely such a package deal, if smoothly prepared, could accomplish several useful goals at a critical moment for the alliance.

NEW RESPONSIBILITIES

Britain, which is accelerating military withdrawal from Asia, could stress its determination to pursue an increasingly "European" policy, thus pleasing the Common Market by accepting precise new military responsibilities. The United States could emphasize its desire to develop NATO's diplomatic potential by proposing an American Secretary General.

The alliance would thereby assume a less "American" look while Britain would have a chance to demonstrate the vigor of its proclaimed "European" intentions.

FLORIDA EDITOR AND PUBLISHER SELLS THE HIGHLANDER

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for more than 20 years the Highlander, a newspaper published at Lake Wales, Fla., has been published by a good friend and University of Montana classmate, Bob Lodmell.

The Highlander has been a very successful newspaper and has contributed a great deal to this part of Florida. Because of a recent heart attack, Bob Lodmell has had to reduce his workload, and he and his wife have decided to limit their activities to less demanding tasks in the news business.

I was very sorry to learn of the sale of the newspaper, but I am delighted that he will continue his association under the new editorship of John E. Marsh, Jr.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two articles published in the Highlander of February 1, 1968.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOLD TO JOHN MARSH

The Lake Wales Daily and Sunday Highlander, after more than 20 years of ownership by Mr. and Mrs. Robert O. Lodmell, was sold Thursday to The Lake Wales Publishing Co., an independent corporation.

John E. Marsh, Jr., a Florida resident since 1947, is editor, publisher and general manager of the newspaper effective today.

"I first met Marsh last February and I'm convinced he will be an asset to the newspaper and Lake Wales," Lodmell said. "I have every confidence in his ability and wish him every success."

Marsh said he was glad to have Lodmell's support and, "Lake Wales is an ideal community to me and I look forward to helping in every way I can to help the area grow and be prosperous."

Marsh is the major stockholder in the new company. The only other stockholders are Lodmell and his wife, Mrs. Julia Ann Lodmell.

Marsh said he expects to make many improvements in the daily newspaper, especially in news coverage and advertising services. Improvements in the physical plant are scheduled also.

"But these changes cannot take place immediately," Marsh said. "I hope to spend most of my time during the next few weeks meeting the people of Lake Wales. By the end of February there should be some improvements in the content of the newspaper," Marsh said.

"No personnel changes are planned," Marsh said.

Mr. and Mrs. Lodmell will continue to be employed by the new owner and he will also write a column with independent views.

Sale price for the newspaper was not announced.

Born in Texas, Marsh was educated at a Connecticut prep school and Northwestern University. He moved to Clearwater, Fla., in 1947 with his parents.

His newspaper experience has been varied, but most of his training has been in the news and editorial departments.

He has worked for daily newspapers in Baytown, Texas; Alexandria, La.; Greensboro, N.C., and most recently, Orlando, Fla., where his family is now.

His family will join him in Lake Wales in June when school ends for summer vacation. They are members of the Episcopal Church.

(By Bob Lodmell)

Just as Ed Chandley was selective in choosing me as his successor as editor and publisher of *The Highlander* over 20 years ago, so have I been selective in choosing my successor—John E. Marsh, Jr.

At the time Ed sold *The Highlander* to me, he had a higher offer from a newspaper chain, but he wanted *The Highlander* to remain a home-town newspaper, operated by people who would be part of the community. And so it was with me.

In selling *The Highlander* to John, I am bringing to Lake Wales a young man (29) who attended the Medill School of Journalism at Northwestern University and has several years of practical newspaper experience. He comes from a newspaper family.

At the end of the school term, John's wife and three children will move here from Orlando. The Marsh family will become a part of the community, taking an interest in our schools, churches, clubs and local affairs.

During the past few years, much of my time has been taken up with saying "no" to would-be buyers, some of them newspaper chains. *The Highlander* became a highly-sought-after newspaper property for several reasons.

It was the first daily newspaper in Florida—and one of the first in the nation—to invest in costly and revolutionary offset printing presses which made it possible to use other automated equipment.

With this equipment, *The Highlander* was able to expand its news coverage, particularly local photographs with a superior degree of quality. And, it also was able to expand its commercial printing of circulars and catalogs with customers as far away as Colorado and New Jersey with press runs in the millions.

Then, too, *The Highlander* is located in an ideal community—in Florida, where, one newspaper broker remarked, a newspaper is worth ten times as much as a newspaper in South Dakota doing the same volume of business.

My wife, Julia Ann, and I have enjoyed

publishing *The Highlander* and we intend to continue working for the newspaper, but not at the hectic pace that we have for 20 years. During that period, we have had only two vacations of two weeks or longer. We intend to make up for it now.

Since I had a heart attack five years ago, I have had to slow down my pace, but this has put an additional burden on Julia Ann, one of the reasons for the sale.

As I learned at that time, no man is indispensable. Up until then, I felt *The Highlander* would fall to publish unless I supervised every detail.

After the heart attack, I did not enter my office for three months—and to my chagrin they were three of the best months on record.

But it was only because Julia Ann and my long-time secretary, Margaret Haas, took over my administrative duties and other loyal employees increased their efforts. Among them, still with *The Highlander*, are Margaret, Pat Barfield, Jerry Bowers, Lyvern Fulmer, Hazel Robinson, Karen Samann and Mel Strandburg.

Since then these loyal staff members have joined *The Highlander*: George Younge, James Fulmer, Lanona Jones, Jessie Bracken, Johnny M. Condrey, Rachel Ferraez, Lucy McKnight, Kay Seymour, Phil Holt, H. C. Marshall, Mrs. Susie Johnson, Mrs. Fran Culp and Mrs. Wanda Feathers. The latter five are in the circulation department and are backed up by about 25 young business men who buy their papers wholesale and sell them retail.

They, I am sure, will show the same loyalty to John.

John and I have been discussing the possibility of a sale for almost a year, but it was not consummated until today.

I can sense in him the same degree of excitement and enthusiasm that I experienced 20 years ago . . . and I am confident he will improve and expand the newspaper we will always love.

We thank you.

Julia Ann and Bob Lodmell

THE CITIES, UNEMPLOYMENT, AND THE EFFORT OF ONE COMPANY

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, human misery, unemployment, and consequent civil disruption, constitute the unfortunate and dangerous climate in many core cities of the United States today. The problems are primarily those of men, not of mortar; and they are many and complex.

The remedies—according to the President's Commission on Civil Disorders—lie in "the commitment to national action—compassionate, massive and sustained," backed by the tremendous resources of this Nation. And on the part of every American it will require "new attitudes, new understanding and above all, new will."

The recent report from the President's Commission on Civil Disorders states:

Pervasive unemployment and underemployment are the most persistent and serious grievances in the Negro ghetto. They are inextricably linked to the problem of civil disorder.

"I want to work but I just can't find a job," is more than an expression of personal economic tragedy—it is a denigration of human dignity which this country cannot afford.

As we continue to search for ways and means to correct this problem, we have been brought to the realization that only through practical and constructive effort

on the part of all sectors in our society to provide work and training for men and women can we hope to maintain that respect for our system essential to the preservation of our society.

Although Government at all levels must lead and contribute, Government cannot, nor should it try to, do the whole job. Responsible businesses and industrial leaders must create and foster participation from the private sector. Fortunately, there is growing evidence that enlightened businessmen are becoming increasingly aware of the degree these domestic problems can, and do, affect not only their businesses, but the lives, security, and happiness of each and every one of us. I would hope that all Americans would soon recognize that in the efforts undertaken to rebuild the cities, dissolve the ghettos, and employ the jobless, lie solid and needed foundations for the future.

For these reasons, I am glad that today we are witnessing the beginnings of a broadly based "private sector" effort to join hands with Government and labor in the vital task of improving America.

There are some in this country who believe any such effort will prove futile; for while there have been many instances of cooperative endeavor on the part of Government and business, particularly in times of national emergency, it is felt by these doubters that the basic aims and objectives of the two sectors are so widely disparate no long-term or really meaningful partnership is likely to evolve. The aim of government, these people argue, is the larger public welfare, while that of business is simply private aggrandizement. Government seeks the long-term good of the many, while business seeks only to advance the material wealth of the few.

Fortunately, this extreme opinion is not too widely held. But it is prevalent enough to be cause of concern.

An article in the *Wall Street Journal* last year stated that "word on the college campus is that business is for the birds."

This article went on to say that less and less young people are planning careers in business when they complete their educations. At Harvard, for example, only 14 percent of a recent year's graduates entered business, as compared with 40 percent a few years earlier. And the reason most often cited for this thinking on the part of the new graduates in question was that business had failed to evolve concepts of social and moral responsibility so as to keep pace with the changing conditions of our world.

There is some justification for this criticism. I, for one, am convinced however, that it results from a lack of true understanding of industry's role in a free society. Nor does it take into consideration the high contribution American business is making to the Nation's progress, both economically and socially.

We know of the spark free enterprise has provided to our economic development. By mobilizing our energy, initiative and ability, it has helped to advance the welfare of millions further than any previous system ever advanced the welfare of even a chosen few.

Today, the commitment of much of industry to the public welfare extends far beyond its traditional role of maker, provider and doer. Tomorrow that commitment needs to be even greater.

In recent months, the chief executive officers of some of our outstanding firms have stressed that businessmen must assume a broader leadership role in the Nation's fight against its social and economic ills.

It might be alleged, of course, that these expressions of commitment on the part of businessmen are mere window dressing, manifestations of just another public relations effort. And it is true that almost anything a business does has an impact on its public relations. If a company improves working conditions, or contributes to higher education, or supports a local Scout troop, it can expect to receive some public relations value in return—and what is wrong with that?

We would hope, however, that industry is motivated both by an interest in public relations, and by a commitment to social progress, because business has an equal stake in the Nation's continued well-being.

INDUSTRIAL INITIATIVE

In this latter regard, I was impressed by the recent statement of my friend, Paul A. Gorman, president of Western Electric Co. He said:

Businessmen know that the goals of the Republic will not be achieved without their assistance. They know, too, that the future of the free enterprise system depends on the responsiveness of that system to the needs of the society that nurtures it. They know that, increasingly, business must look upon its community responsibilities as something inseparable from its economic function. They are aware, in short, that business does not serve its customers, its employees, its stockholders and the nation at large simply by performing well today; it must seek to nurture and enhance a community environment in which it can perform well tomorrow and in the years ahead.

I accept that enlightened industry means what it says in this area of social involvement. But what evidence is there that business is assuming a helpful role?

Recently I had occasion to discuss this and related questions with Mr. Gorman. He presented that his firm has passed through at least three stages in the effort to develop a creative and meaningful approach to the problems of the cities.

In the initial stage, Western Electric management sought to learn as much as possible about the larger dimensions of the urban crisis. It sought also to achieve a true sense of common purpose among employees at every level, the premise being that when you talk about effective action on the part of a business, automatically you are talking about the combined action of many individual men and women. Hence, for a company to reach the goals desired, it must first enlist employees who have obtained a thorough grasp of both what is needed, and what can be realistically accomplished.

Business leaders should—and in ever increasing numbers do—have a wide understanding of what the problems are and what the ills of the core city portend. They should be sensitive to the problems of the poor. They will need to

understand the problems of the Nation's minority groups, and be aware of the dangers that neglect of our natural resources will aggravate.

In short, they should learn before doing.

At Western Electric, I was told that this learning process has taken a variety of forms. For example:

A number of committees, task forces and study groups were organized to gather and analyze data on the whole gamut of perceived problems.

A series of 2-day seminars were conducted, at which the firm's top management engaged in person to person discussion of urban problems with such key Negro leaders as James Farmer, Whitney Young, Roy Wilkins, Dr. Kenneth Clark, and James Forman.

In order to win support and encourage voluntary participation in the planned programs to aid the disadvantaged, the company thereupon launched a nationwide communications program. Company policies in such areas as equal employment opportunity, public affairs, and community relations were presented to all employees.

Information on urban problems, employment, air and water pollution, noise, and education were also made an integral and significant part of the firm's management training programs, and data on these and other matters were—and are—disseminated regularly through employee publications.

Finally, a dialog on business involvement in urban problems was encouraged. This dialog continues between Western Electric executives, and leaders of government, education, and organizations representing minority groups.

With information obtained by these and other methods, the firm moved into the second stage of its interest and effort. That stage consisted of a thorough analysis of what should be done in the social arena, with plans and programs to prepare itself accordingly. The company felt it could make a significant contribution in the areas of education and employment. In recent years and months, in the action stage of its approach to the urban crisis, Western Electric has instituted many programs aimed at these problems.

TRAINING AND EDUCATIONAL EFFORTS

In the field of education, Western Electric has instituted many programs to advance the skills of the undereducated, underemployed and unemployed. A few examples:

Virtually all of the company's major plant locations conduct programs aimed at reaching high school students considered to be potential dropouts. These programs involve bringing the students into the firm's offices and factories to get a close-up view of the "world of work" and to note the close relationship between education and employment. In many instances, management people are assigned to work with, and counsel, marginal students throughout the school year.

Mr. Gorman told me that one of the earliest of these programs was instituted at the company's Merrimack Valley Works, near North Andover, Mass. Here

the aim is to reach students experiencing scholastic difficulties, or who are poorly career-oriented, or who lack incentive in the view of their respective school guidance counselors. At the plant, in a program lasting several weeks, they talk informally with Western Electric employees about their experiences, view films on the importance of education, and take a number of tests developed by the company and its consultants so as to determine how best they can qualify themselves for employment.

General managers at plants in Indiana, Oklahoma, Illinois, Nebraska, and North Carolina have instituted so-called in-plant high schools. Their purpose is to enable employees to raise their educational level, usually to the 12th grade. Since 1963, when the program was inaugurated, over 1,000 Western Electric employees have acquired high school diplomas through in-plant schools. Several have gone on to college by means of assistance from the firm's tuition refund plan.

In New York City, Western Electric has formed a volunteer organization of employees who devote a substantial part of their own time to aid the disadvantaged.

Also launched in New York is a program called Preparing Youth for Employment, which seeks to encourage students to complete high school, and thereby become more aware of, and better prepared for job opportunities. In addition to discussions between students and Western Electric employees, parents of the students are invited to participate in some of the sessions when discussion centers around the broad-scale negative implications of underachievement and undereducation.

In addition, the company's New York headquarters has begun development of a special training program for personnel of the city's human resources administration; has helped the city school board create a "workshop" on job opportunities for disadvantaged youth; and has assigned one of its people as Metropolitan Coordinator of the Vice President's Task Force on Youth Motivation. Since August of 1967 the latter group has made presentations before some 9,650 ghetto youth. It expects to reach more than 40,000 youngsters by the first of June.

In New Jersey, the Western Electric manager recognized some years ago that in many cases the public schools were training students for an industrial world that no longer exists. Working with local school administrators from 1962 on, they have played a key role in helping to broaden the dialog between educators and the business community. As a result, in 1963 Bayonne High School set up a new "basic technology" course for non-college-bound freshmen, featuring 3 years of industrially oriented science and mathematics; in 1964, Kearny High School instituted an electronics laboratory for non-college-bound youth, together with new courses in physics and chemistry; and in 1965 Cateret High School introduced a new Western Electric-designed math course—called Techmatics—as well as courses in applied chemistry, applied science, practical electronics, and electricity.

EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY AND SKILL
IMPROVEMENT

In the matter of providing equal employment opportunity, in 1961 the company assigned responsibility for its policy of nondiscrimination to its vice president, personnel and labor relations. He has been assisted by a competent, high-level staff including the company personnel director and several other executives. Supporting their activities is an interdivisional coordinating committee with responsibility for providing across-the-board consistency and continuity in policies incident to equal employment.

In addition, the company has appointed a manager with full-time responsibility for administration of non-discriminatory practices. He and his staff are charged with conducting thoroughgoing studies to obtain total adherence to the firm's equal employment policy.

As a result, the company has been able to increase its minority employment threefold since 1961. Today over 16,000 members of minority groups are employed, with several hundred in technical, professional, and supervisory ranks.

Increasingly, Mr. Gorman explained, Western Electric and its associated companies have been launching programs aimed directly at the hard-core unemployed. Some of these companies have instituted programs completely on their own, while others are working through industry groups or service organizations.

One of the earliest of these undertakings was a project dubbed the skill level improvement project, first conceived by Western Electric officials in Phoenix, Ariz. It has since spread to three additional company locations, in New York, Utah, and Oregon. Company classrooms and equipment are used; and company people, together with representatives of local Urban League chapters, contribute time to help instruct classes in shorthand, typing, business math, and English.

Graduates of the course have been notably successful in obtaining jobs on their own after their skills have been sharpened. Urban League officials in Phoenix have termed the program "one of the most successful in the league's history and one which promises to be a prototype in this community and across the Nation."

In my own State of Missouri, the company is assisting the hard-core unemployed with both jobs and training. James A. Hosford, general manager of the Western Electric plant in Lee's Summit near Kansas City, heads a special committee charged with increasing job opportunities for minority groups, including Negroes, Indians, and Mexican-Americans. In January Hosford and other business leaders worked on finding employment for the city's 5,000 hard-core jobless, suggesting the relaxation of some educational requirements along with the setting up of broad-scale training projects, with industry funds.

Assistance of a different kind—equipment, supplies, temporary office space, and financial support—has been extended to the disadvantaged by company branches in Philadelphia, Baltimore, Oklahoma City, and San Francisco. All four locations are backing local offices of

the Opportunities Industrialization Center, OIC, a self-help organization, provides skills training for both the unemployed and the underemployed. Its success in placing the disadvantaged into jobs has stirred interest all across the Nation. Special efforts are being made by the company to recruit and hire the graduates of OIC training programs.

A program that has attracted considerable attention at the Federal level is the skills escalation and employment development project—SEED, for short—a joint industry-Government effort set up by Western Electric and a number of other firms in Newark, N.J.

SEED grew directly out of the Western Electric skills escalation project—begun in September 1965—which offered machine shop training, free of charge, to unemployed or underemployed men in the Newark area. Consisting of classroom work followed by actual shop experience at the company's factory at nearby Kearny, N.J., the success of the project motivated business and community leaders to launch the expanded SEED undertaking, which today is providing jobs or training for some 2,500 hard-core unemployed each year.

In Chicago, since 1963, Western Electric has been hiring so-called unemployables, and teaching them such skills as typing, comptometry, and relay adjusting.

More recently, the head of the company's plant in suburban Cicero, Ill., launched a program aimed at broadening the economic base of slum neighborhoods by helping to establish small businesses on Chicago's South Side.

To get the program started, Western Electric executives first selected a young Negro with basic woodworking skills, then assigned a team of accountants, engineers, and production specialists to teach him the rudiments of business management. Following this, they helped arrange bank financing in the amount of \$15,000. This enabled this man to purchase machinery, lease a factory, and begin to recruit employees.

At the end of January, the Chicago Custom Woodworking Co. opened for business. It is hoped that this will be only the first of many such ghetto firms. The company is working on more, and putting together a film which it hopes will influence other large firms to develop comparable small businesses.

A Western Electric vice president has joined others in sponsoring a weekly television program aimed at helping the jobless to find employment opportunities in the Chicago area. Each Saturday afternoon a specially produced, half-hour program is presented in cooperation with the Illinois State Employment Service, the Urban League, and the Chicago Merit Employment Committee. Viewers are told of jobs immediately available and are invited to apply for them by calling a special "action line" telephone number. The Urban League reports that at least 6,000 Chicagoans have found jobs by this means since the program began only a few months ago.

In many more cities, the company is working hard on the problem of unemployment. As example:

In Omaha, a representative of the firm is coordinating efforts to retrain and reemploy 2,200 persons who will be displaced as a result of the imminent shutdown of a local meatpacking facility.

In Atlanta, Miami, and Nashville, a program has been instituted to hire and train undereducated Negroes for entry-level positions in the company's installation organization.

In Los Angeles, a Western Electric plant is hiring people with reading levels of seventh grade or less and, for 8 to 10 weeks, allotting 2 hours of each working day to instructing them in basic education.

In Denver, some 30-odd Western Electric people are engaged in tutoring children from low-income neighborhoods in reading, writing, mathematics, and science.

In Winston-Salem, a Western Electric executive is coordinating activities of various public and private agencies concerned with finding jobs for the handicapped and the unskilled.

In Newark, N.J., the company plans to open a small factory immediately adjacent to the scene of last year's massive rioting. Here jobs will be made available to ghetto residents who can satisfactorily meet job-performance requirements, whether or not they possess the standard qualifications. The new factory is part of a joint industrial effort, and hopefully it will provide a model for similar undertakings elsewhere.

In summary, here is an American corporation that is attempting to match words with deeds, that is striving to establish truly meaningful and significant policies and programs so as to make the promise of America come true.

They would be the first to say that what has been done is not adequate. But it is a start.

These Western Electric examples are but representative of a large and growing number of other businesses across the Nation, businesses which recognize their deep obligations to society.

Let us hope that the day when business was business, and nothing more, now belongs to a bygone era. The modern corporation could be, and we hope will be, one of the most effective instruments of social change; a custodian of human resources, and an agent for reaching socially desired objectives.

This corporation is, and we believe many others are, realizing the broad and basic rewards that can only follow if they become partners in the search for a better life for all our citizens. This is a most promising development, and it is only the beginning. Despite the impressive strides already made in the direction of increased social involvement, businessmen I talk to speak of plans for even broader and more intensive efforts in the future.

As mentioned earlier, there may be some who view the businessman's commitment to social involvement as nothing more than a public relations gimmick. In this regard, I hope the facts presented here will help to dispel such misconceptions.

In conclusion, therefore, I believe that a large segment of the business com-

munity means what it says about trying to do its part to help resolve the critical problems we face today; and further, that this same segment now provides a challenging arena for all people who realize the practical importance of such effort.

DEATH OF FORMER SPEAKER JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, with the death of Speaker Joseph W. Martin, Jr., the Commonwealth of Massachusetts has lost a great son, the Republican Party has lost a vital leader, and the entire Nation has lost a great public servant.

Joe Martin led a rich and full life. Born the son of a blacksmith in North Attleboro in 1884, he was the shortstop on a semipro baseball team, and a newspaper reporter and publisher, and then commenced his political career in 1911 when he first won public office in the Massachusetts Legislature.

The year 1924 witnessed the beginning of Mr. Martin's 42 years in the U.S. House of Representatives—two decades of which he was its Republican leader. He was chairman of five Republican National Conventions, and served as the national chairman of the Republican Party. Joe Martin's devotion to his party during his half-century political career more than earned him his title of "Mr. Republican."

Although we were of different political persuasions, the Speaker represented what I consider to be the best of the great tradition of Massachusetts sons who come out of the State to a full and dedicated life of public service. I know all the people of Massachusetts, regardless of party affiliation, held Joe Martin in the highest esteem and join with me in mourning his passing. He leaves behind him a monument of accomplishments which will be a source of inspiration for generations yet to come.

U.S. PRESSURES ON ISRAEL TO RETREAT: A MISTAKEN POLICY

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, at a time when U.S. arms shipments to Jordan have been resumed and when the United States is dragging its feet on shipping arms to Israel, it ill behooves the United States to bring pressure on Israel to accede to Arab demands that Israel retreat.

A report sent to the New York Times by Eric Pace from Cairo under the date-line of March 5 states "usually reliable sources" revealed that, contrary to a statement issued by Israel on February 22, 1968, the U.S. Department of State had sent a note to the Government of Israel urging it to "enter into indirect but substantive negotiations with the Arabs and, in general, to facilitate the peacemaking efforts of Dr. Gunnar V. Jarring, the special United Nations representative."

More disturbing is the statement that the Department "expressed regret of Israel policy on Jerusalem, Israel contends that the incorporation of the former Arab sector of the city into the Israeli section is irreversible."

I hope that this report does not accurately reflect the facts, although a special dispatch to the New York Times, printed at the conclusion of the Cairo report, states:

Privately, Government officials confirmed that the Rusk message had been sent to Mr. Eban [Israeli Foreign Minister] early in February.

I stated on December 13, 1967, that it was important that the United States "buttress Israel's determination not to give up any territory occupied by it in its 6-day war unless and until, at the very least, the Arab nations declare unmistakably that they are no longer at war with Israel and are willing to negotiate directly with Israel to arrive at binding agreements designed to insure lasting peace in the Middle East."

Without such firm assurances it would be the height of folly for Israel to give up a single inch of its post-1967 war boundaries so necessary for its defense.

It would be equal folly for the United States to refuse to recognize this and to begin to pressure Israel into taking a position so dangerous to Israel's own survival.

I ask unanimous consent that the dispatch by Mr. Pace from Cairo, as published in the New York Times of March 6, 1968, by and entitled "United States Is Said To Have Informed Egypt of Appeal to Israel To Accept U.N. Stand" be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 6, 1968]
UNITED STATES IS SAID TO HAVE INFORMED
EGYPT OF APPEAL TO ISRAEL TO ACCEPT U.N.
STAND

(By Eric Pace)

CAIRO, March 5.—Usually reliable sources said tonight that the State Department had informed Cairo of a message from Secretary of State Dean Rusk urging that Israel accept the United Nations Security Council resolution on the Middle East.

The message, described as being addressed to Foreign Minister Abba Eban, was said to have also called on the Israelis to enter into indirect but substantive negotiations with the Arabs and, in general, to facilitate the peacemaking efforts of Dr. Gunnar V. Jarring, the special United Nations representative.

The report appears to contradict a statement on Feb. 22 by Gideon Rafael, Director General of the Israeli Foreign Ministry, denying that a note had been received from Mr. Rusk pressing Israel to relax her demand for direct Arab-Israeli negotiations. The existence of the note was reported by The New York Times from Washington the day before.

The State Department's purpose in informing the Government of President Gamal Abdel Nasser of its message to Israel appeared to be to generate goodwill as well as sympathy for the United States in its efforts to help bring about a peaceful settlement.

Cairo officials have frequently contended there was a lack of interest in the Middle Eastern problem and failure to put pressure on Israel to make concessions.

The sources, who declined to be identified, said the Rusk message, as conveyed by the State Department, expressed regret over Israeli policy on Jerusalem. Israel contends that the incorporation of the former Arab sector of the city into the Israeli sector is irreversible.

In addition, the informants reported that

the message had warned Israel that if the question of the Middle East came up for debate in the Security Council again, the prospects for the success of the Jarring mission would be impeded. The mission was provided for in the Council resolution, adopted Nov. 22, which also calls for an Israeli withdrawal from territories seized in the June war and for Arab recognition of Israel's territorial integrity.

The Jordanian Foreign Ministry has threatened to take the Jerusalem question before the Security Council if Israel does not relax her stand.

With regard to the council resolution, Israel has not publicly and explicitly accepted its terms, which also call for the ending of the state of war between Israel and the Arab states, acceptance of secure, boundaries for all states, freedom of navigation through international waterways and just settlement of the Arab refugee problem.

Israeli officials have recently indicated that they would be willing to enter into some form of indirect negotiations. The Egyptian Government, according to informed sources, has told United Nations officials that it would be willing to send representatives to Cyprus to engage in indirect contacts with Israeli representatives through the United Nations mediation, provided Israel agreed to implement the Council resolution in its entirety.

Jordan is expected to agree to such indirect, substantive talks if the United Arab Republic does. Syria's militant left-wing Government rejects the idea of a peaceful settlement.

WATER IS THE KEY TO IDAHO'S FUTURE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, 2 years ago, the National Wildlife Federation gave highly deserved recognition to FRANK CHURCH, the distinguished senior Senator from Idaho, for his work in the Senate in furthering conservation legislation. Among all the Members of Congress, Senator CHURCH was named by the federation as the outstanding legislator in the field of conservation for 1965.

Recently, Senator HENRY JACKSON, of Washington, chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, spoke at a Jefferson-Jackson dinner in Boise, Idaho. It was a factual, forthright speech. Not only did Senator JACKSON present a fine synopsis of the issues facing the Nation, but he reviewed the exceptional contributions that FRANK CHURCH has made in prudent resource management and development for the State of Idaho and the country at large.

I commend the speech to the attention of the Senate, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I will speak first about a burden we all bear, a problem with no end in sight, a situation we can expect will get worse before it gets better—and that is the quality of television programs.

This is a crisis which challenges our political leadership. I propose that some of our leading politicians personally step into the breach and attack the entertainment gap. So many actors have been taking the place of politicians lately, it seems only fair that politicians have a chance to take the place of actors. Perhaps it could develop into a permanent exchange program, although we must keep in mind the old axiom that while all politicians make good comedians, not all comedians make good politicians.

So much for the "entertainment gap."

Now let me suggest we work on eliminating the "memory gap."

We Democrats have gotten so used to accomplishing things that we allow people to forget what has been done.

Well, let's just stop a minute and remedy that. Let's enjoy the pride and personal satisfaction of recalling just a little of what we Democrats have accomplished—just lately.

We want the best education for every American child. So we passed historic education legislation. The Federal Government has invested twice as much on education since 1963 as in the whole previous century.

Last year 9 million children in our country were helped in securing a better education because of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Aren't the Republicans interested in education? Sure they are, but three-quarters of the Republicans in the House of Representatives voted against aid to elementary and secondary education. We Democrats passed it.

We also sponsored and passed aid to higher education. A million and a quarter low-income students are in college today because of our Democratic grant and loan programs.

We want to protect the health of our people and assure proper medical care for older citizens. After a 20-year struggle we passed Medicare. Today, decent medical care is the right of almost 20 million older Americans. Seven and a half million senior Americans received care under the program last year. Well, aren't the Republicans interested in the health of senior Americans? Sure. But 93 per cent of them voted against Medicare in the House of Representatives.

We Democrats are serious about improving the health opportunities of all Americans. The national investment in health is now three times what it was in 1964.

We are also serious about maintaining prosperity. We have now seen 83 months of unbroken economic expansion. Unemployment is at its lowest point in 15 years. The national income grew three times as fast between 1961 and 1967 as it grew in the preceding five years. Real personal incomes grew more during any one of those years than in the five years from 1956 to 1961 put together.

And taxes are down. Don't let anyone forget that we Democrats were responsible for the biggest tax cut in history. Even if we have to pass the temporary tax increase President Johnson has requested to meet our commitments at home and abroad, and keep our economy in balance—Federal taxes will still be lower than what they would have been at the 1961 rates—the rates the last Republican Administration left us.

We have a lot more to do in America. We're not resting—not we Democrats. In 1967 our Gross National Product grew about \$43 billion. In 1968 it will grow over \$50 billion. We know we can afford to do what has to be done.

We also know there is a lot we can't afford in our country. We can't afford poor schools—we can't afford neglected children—we can't afford inadequate housing for our families—we can't afford opportunity denied.

Despite the foot-draggers and the doom-criers we're attacking the problems America faces—slums—rural poverty—crime—the destruction of our healthy environment—decay in our cities—discrimination—iniquity for the American farmer.

President Johnson has challenged the Congress to act now to meet some critical needs—a manpower program, enlisting private enterprise to wipe out hard core unemployment.

A housing program that will mean a six-fold increase in low and middle income housing construction over the next decade;

A child health program;

Protection for the American consumer;

Drug control, to "stop the sale of slavery to the young";

A farm program to help farmers bargain more effectively for a fair share of American prosperity.

If we fail to accomplish this for America in this Congress it won't be because of the state of the economy, it won't be because we can't afford it, it won't be because of Vietnam—it will be because in 1966 we lost 47 seats in the House of Representatives to people who vote no.

Let's remedy that in 1968. Don't let our country slip back. Re-elect the Johnson-Humphrey Administration. Give us a workable Democratic majority in the Congress. Keep building a better America.

While we are building a better America, we will also be building a better Northwest and a better Idaho. The great water and related land resources of our region are crucial to our future growth and prosperity—particularly in Idaho.

Idaho is fortunate to have both of your Senators serving on the Interior Committee where we handle much of the resources legislation affecting this State, Idaho and our country are fortunate to have as a ranking member of the Committee and Chairman of the Public Lands Subcommittee your great senior Senator, Frank Church. What a great list of accomplishments he has:

He authored the National Wild and Scenic Rivers Bill which has twice passed the Senate, with provisions he carefully designed and persuaded our Committee to adopt in the best interests of the State of Idaho;

He sponsored legislation to establish the Sawtooth National Recreation area, the Nez Perce National Historic Park, and to preserve the Upper Priest Lake in Northern Idaho;

He served as floor manager in the Senate of two of the most important pieces of conservation legislation ever enacted—the Wilderness Act, and the Land and Water Conservation Fund;

He secured Congressional authorization for the Mann Creek project, the Teton Basin project, and legislation to rehabilitate and extend existing reclamation projects;

He has pushed the proposed Southwest Idaho Water Development Project in which your State has such a great stake. He even arranged hearings on this project before our Committee in advance of submittal of a report on the project by the Secretary of the Interior.

Frankly, I can't recall anyone pulling off such a coup before. My hat is off to you, Frank.

One of the major undertakings of the 89th Congress on which I worked with the Senators from Idaho was the establishment of a Columbia Basin Account. Frank Church was a leader in that endeavor. He took great care to see that we took care of Idaho.

The Columbia Basin Account pools the power revenues from hydroelectric facilities in the Federal Columbia River System. The revenues which are surplus after repaying the costs of dam construction and maintenance are then available to assist irrigation where the costs are beyond the ability of the water users to repay.

In the Basin Account we protected both the future of Northwest irrigation development and the maintenance of low-cost electric power rates. I know you have a growing interest in power and power rates as well as irrigation in Idaho.

Let me point out one thing about the Basin Account, which helps assure the availability of irrigation development funds for Idaho as well as the rest of the Pacific Northwest. Most of the power generation is in the State of Washington, and most of the power revenues come from the State of Washington. So, you can see that Frank Church is a very persuasive man.

Idaho needs that kind of persuasiveness in the United States Senate. We of the Pacific Northwest need his persuasiveness to fight

shoulder to shoulder with us against a threat to our future well-being.

Just a few days ago I read in the press that another Californian had proposed another plan to divert so-called "surplus" water from the Snake River to provide for California's "future" water needs.

Just this week in a Subcommittee in the House of Representatives they have been approving—over the strong opposition of our Northwest Representatives—legislation to authorize studies of large-scale water diversion from our rivers.

Legislation approved by the House Interior Committee in the 89th Congress was aimed at diverting at least 8½ million acre feet. The Snake River—Idaho's main source of undeveloped irrigation water—averages an annual flow of only 7 to 8 million acre feet. Simple arithmetic would show not much left for Idaho if they succeeded in taking what they want out of the Snake. And make no mistake about it, they covet the Snake. They see it as the cheapest source to them. This is so because the Snake is closest to where they want to take the water into the Colorado River. Also, because the elevation of the Snake River is over 3,000 feet the water would not have to be pumped so high to carry it over the mountains to the Colorado.

Don't let anyone tell you they need our water. Little children are not perishing of thirst in California. They are doing very well in California, thank you, and they don't need our water for drinking purposes. They want our water for growing crops down there that we could just as well grow up here. To make it cheap for them they want the rest of the country to help pay the cost—and don't be surprised if they try to tap our own Columbia Basin Account to pay for siphoning off our own water.

We in the Northwest have drawn the line against efforts to tie diversion studies to pending bills in the Congress. At the same time we have supported establishment of a National Water Commission with authority to study the water requirements of the country. Under the auspices of the National Water Commission, water diversion schemes and other alternatives will receive the thorough and objective scrutiny required in the best interests of the nation.

We in the Northwest have supported major investments in devising feasible techniques to desalt water. The results have been so good that Interior Department experts are already convinced that desalted water will meet the needs of the Southwest at far less cost than importation.

We have supported a major research effort in weather modification. Already, the Department of the Interior has estimated that an operational weather modification program could increase the flow of the Colorado River by 20 per cent at a cost of only \$1.50 per acre foot. They estimate the cost of importing water from the Columbia River would be at least 100 times that much—or over \$150 per acre foot.

Frank Church and I—and other members of the Northwest Congressional delegation—have long supported development of the resources of the Southwest in the Southwest. But we will fight to the end to stop them from developing the resources of the Northwest in the Southwest.

The diversion threat to the Northwest is not small.

It goes far beyond a hampering of irrigation development.

Less water means less power—both hydro and steam.

Less water means higher costs in handling water quality problems.

Less water means damage—possibly destruction—to fisheries resources.

Less water in our rivers means our ground water tables would recede.

Less water means degradation of the rec-

reaction value and natural beauty of our major water courses.

Well, with the help of Frank Church we licked them in the Senate last year. If we have to lick them again, we will need Frank Church to do it. He will be in a key position. As a ranking majority member of our Committee, he will be appointed to the conference committee should this issue have to be resolved between the House and the Senate. With his help, we will prevail. The basic resource of the Northwest will be protected and we can go on working to build a better future for our region and our country.

In building a better Idaho, a better Northwest, and a better America, Frank Church is doing a great job. I know you will do your part to keep him on the job.

Thank you!

WILLING PARTNERS IN TRANSPORTATION

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, St. Louis, Mo., headquarters for the steamboat trade of the last century, is today producing fresh and outstanding leadership in modern river transportation. W. J. Barta, president of the Mississippi Valley Barge Line Co., of St. Louis, has made an analysis of future transportation requirements in a recent paper entitled "A New Look at Willing Partners in Transportation." He rightly points out that the growth and radical change in technology are two powerful forces at work today. These forces, he suggests, will produce a new era in transportation. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this statement be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A NEW LOOK AT WILLING PARTNERS IN TRANSPORTATION

(Remarks of W. J. Barta, president, Mississippi Valley Barge Line Co., before the National Transportation Institute, Transportation Association of America, New York, N.Y., Jan. 31, 1968)

In any thoughtful review of transportation policy, two powerful forces must be given consideration. The first is the extraordinary growth of the most productive economy the world has ever seen. And second is the radical change in technology together with the organization of production and methods of doing business.

Growth and change are continually upsetting preconceived notions about transportation. It is becoming increasingly clear that we cannot build tomorrow's transport system for yesterday's needs. Nor can we rely on yesterday's ideas or assumptions.

Let's take growth first and look at the loads the transportation industry will be expected to carry between now and 1980. Steel ingot production, according to Iron Age, will be at about 175 million tons a year by 1980, compared to 134.1 million tons in 1966.

Many of us are aware of the rapid expansion in the use of fertilizers in agriculture. As recently as 1960, phosphate rock production was at about 18 million tons in the United States. Year after next, industry will have a capacity for 37 million tons. With the world food shortages and the urgent need to use fertilizers to increase food production abroad the prospects are even greater. The so-called developing countries used only six million metric tons of fertilizer in 1966, according to the President's Science Advisory Study. They will be using 40 million tons by the 1980's, a substantial portion of it from the United States.

U.S. potash production was only 2.3 million tons in 1960, it is expected to be 4.7 million tons by 1970 and at that rate of expansion would be near 10 million tons by 1980. The expansion in the use of anhydrous ammonia has been phenomenal and further rapid growth is expected.

The privately owned electric utilities will have \$85 billions invested in plant capacity by 1970 and, according to the Edison Electric Institute, will be installing another \$85 billions in additional capacity by 1980.

Last year they used 250 million tons of coal; by 1980 they expect to be using 500 million tons of coal. Stewart Udall, the Secretary of the Interior, recently predicted total coal output could reach 900 million tons a year by 1980. The key estimates in building and construction—cement, lumber, glass, steel, brick—suggest that there will be a need to transport literally hundreds of millions more tons of commodities in the next few years.

Those responsible for the production and distribution of the nations output are going to be looking for new and different approaches to transportation. Already, the pressure on the transportation industry is heavy. One evidence is that throughout the industry there is a vigorous search for new technologies and the results are easy to spot in every branch of the industry. In the water carrier branch the trend has been to larger volume tows on the river and much greater efficiency compared to 1960. In trucking, more than half the states now permit higher weight and load limits and as a result efficiency of operations has been improved. The railroads are building larger freight cars, operating 10,000 ton unit trains, and otherwise accommodating their complex system to new and different needs.

The insistent pressure of the nation's economic expansion has kept us all busy improving our own particular segment of the industry and this improvement, of course, will continue. I suggest, however, that the same pressure will force us all into a much more objective approach to the routing of traffic. The computer, with its capacity to assemble and analyze vast quantities of complex data, makes a more objective approach to traffic movement inevitable. In this national interest, and in the enlightened business interests of the various carriers, we are bound to see many more combinations of the best efficiencies of the different modes. There is every reason to believe that, viewing future expansion intelligently, different modes are increasingly going to become partners and, increasingly, willing partners on important movements.

Government is dropping more than a few hints that if we do not get on with the job ourselves, there will be highly specific new and supplementary legislation making intermodal coordination absolutely mandatory. Commissioner Rupert L. Murphy, of the I.C.C., complained in November that the voluntary approach is not producing the results which commerce requires. "Cooperation among equals is necessary. There can be no top dog. The sooner this is realized the better it will be for all," he said.

Working with the truck lines in recent years, the barge lines have produced significant new efficiencies. Millions of tons of grain are delivered by truck to river elevators for onward movement by barge. The farmer, as a result, has received a higher market price for his product and the consumer a lower one. Similarly truck delivery of steel products from barges is a thriving business. Sugar, cement, salt and synthetic rubber, to name only a few products, are gathered to the river or delivered by truck. Tank trucks, particularly, are increasingly connecting with specialized tank barges on a number of new chemical and petro-chemical movements and, of course, on gasoline, aviation fuel and fuel oil.

The relationship of the barges with the trucks is growing closer every day. When a barge line thinks of a movement, it simply calls its trucker friends, tells them what is needed, works out a businesslike arrangement on rates and that's it. The shipper has a new, better and cheaper way of organizing production and distribution. The trucker is always a willing partner. However there is a mileage range beyond which truck service is not economical. When this limit is reached, it would be logical to use rail connections. We do not yet have the same kind of businesslike relationship with the railroad industry.

Last September at the University of Indiana I proposed that shippers, railroads and the government take a new look at water-rail coordination problems.

Particularly with new and highly efficient barge technology, it seems clear that on many high volume movements of products it makes economic sense to get the commodity to water by the shortest route. New markets can be reached, reductions in transport costs achieved and more efficient utilization of transport equipment realized.

Since September, the barge industry has set a number of studies in motion. We have begun to ask questions of shippers and railroads about a number of particular movements and a variety of proposals are now under serious discussion. Because of the long tradition of hostility between water and rail modes, we expect to be disappointed on the first few tries. But good sense, good business, sound public policy and the logic of better utilization of the nation's transport resources will, I believe, sooner or later prevail. The shipping public cannot afford, particularly in times of rising costs, to pass up the economies of more extensive use of water transportation in combination with efficient rail service.

We are taking a slightly different approach than we have ever taken before. Instead of going to a railroad with a proposal that isn't fully worked out and asking for its cooperation, and then listening to the traditional long catalog of well-rehearsed reasons why water-rail coordination is not in the interest of the railroads, we are constructing what we call "willing partner" connecting rates.

There is no longer any great mystery about what a railroad can do for a "willing partner" if it wants to under given circumstances. Cost information on rail movements is generally available; division information is also available. Furthermore, under attack before the I.C.C., railroads have produced vast quantities of highly specific factual information on the economics of rail service. It is, therefore, not too difficult to develop a whole series of "willing partner" rates on particular traffic. We can go to the shippers and railroads, show them the public interest savings available through water-rail coordination and simply ask the railroads to treat the water carrier exactly as they treat their "willing partners" in the railroad industry. We do not make a judgment on the level of a rail rate or the amount of a rail division. We ask only for the same divisions and the same service they would provide as a "willing partner."

For example, the unit train rates have been extensively litigated and a number of companies have made studies of how to make the best use of a unit train. What overall savings might be achieved by a shipper if he could bring together unit trains and barge service? We have developed a number of ideas for this approach and are trying them out on shippers and with some railroads. We assume that if we throw enough good business propositions at railroads and back them up with shipper interest we ought to get some action.

The first action is likely to be some reductions in all-rail rates. This, we have been

told, is already beginning to happen on some movements we have questioned. We have located movements where there seems to be a potential of from \$2 to \$7 a ton savings to the shipper through the use of rail-water service. We lay out the "willing partner" relationships and, of course, the shipper calls his railroad friends at once. Down comes the all-rail rate. If we don't generate a ton of additional freight for the water carriers this year, our little campaign will probably do a lot of good for shippers before the snow flies again in the fall.

At the same time we are increasingly understanding the point of view of the railroad and we must meet head-on some of the problems he has with rail-water coordination. The most serious and the most important is that he believes his best interests in all cases are served when he locks the traffic into the longest possible haul by rail whether on his line or on a combination of lines. In this he is no different from everyone else in transportation, whether airline, truck or barge line. We all try for the long hauls when we can.

If the traditional hostility to any kind of business relationships with water carriers is removed, we believe we may be able to overcome this problem with many individual railroads and demonstrate that the best interest of particular railroads may well be in connecting with a water carrier.

Of course the railroad private interest, the truck private interest or the barge private interest is not the final test. The shipper interest in lower overall rates and the national interest in efficient utilization of available transport resources also should weigh heavily on the scales.

But we can usefully start with issues of business self-interest. Why would a railroad find it good business to work as a "willing partner" with a water carrier?

First, a railroad can often make more money connecting with a barge line than connecting with another railroad. The railroads themselves have begun to demonstrate an increasing interest in better utilization of their equipment. The shuttle unit train with dedicated equipment, 100 percent empty return and severe restrictions on the length of time a shipper can hold a car for loading and unloading, demonstrate the railroad concern with the problem of utilization. Applying the shuttle idea to a connection with a barge service could produce dramatic economies for the shipper and higher earnings for the railroad. For example, the average unit train rate on coal is about 6/10ths of a cent per ton mile. Assume a rate of 8 or 9/10ths of a cent per ton mile for 200 to 300 miles, a distance beyond the usual range of truck connecting service. Load the freight car twice a week instead of the industry average of 16.2 times a year. Annual revenue for the freight car would be between \$18,000 and \$27,000 instead of the industry average of about \$4,900. Of course expenses would be up too, but there would be ample revenue for substantial earnings. Therefore, if it results in high utilization of its equipment, the railroad might find it more profitable to work with a barge line than a connecting railroad.

Second, an individual railroad, particularly a small railroad, frequently recognizes that there are important traffic potentials which it cannot touch because a competing railroad refuses to short haul itself or demands an excessive division for a connection. The excluded railroad could, however, participate in that traffic on a highly profitable basis with a water connection. One railroad, discussing such a movement, freely said it would be like finding a "pot of gold." It couldn't propose such a movement, however, for fear of retaliation by its railroad connections on other traffic, but it would certainly like to be forced into the movement by a shipper or the ICC.

Third, there is little rhyme or reason to the system of divisions between railroads and

some of them, judging by the complaints one hears, are at starvation levels for some railroads. On one movement we have been studying, there is a potential for a \$5 a ton saving to a shipper if a barge-rail connection were made using as a connecting rail rate the exact same division and the exact same connecting point as the all-rail service, with the barge service absorbing all transfer costs. The shipper could be very happy indeed with a \$4 reduction in his overall charges and the railroad well-rewarded with a much more profitable division instead of a starvation division.

Now these are radical new thoughts to some people and the machinery creaks and groans when the ideas are proposed. I look for no early change in the climate, but nevertheless we are living in a time of radical change. In very general terms, we have found that anyone paying \$8 or more a ton for 1,000 miles of railroad transportation ought to look into the possibilities of truck-water, or rail-water alternatives. Shippers paying even lower rail rates for 1,000 miles may also find that the barge-rail alternative is lower in price or the same in price. If it is only the same in price, they will have the advantage of an alternative competitive route with all the benefits which flow from competition. The shipper will not be locked into one service; he will preserve that all-important freedom of choice.

I am not expecting wholesale diversion of present all-rail traffic to rail-water or truck-water service. A lower rate is not always controlling with a shipper. A water-rail innovation which should result in participation in the traffic may not do so. There are many complex considerations which govern the routing of traffic. It is my belief that too many companies have been overlooking the economies of water-rail coordination and have been too easily put off by traditional hostilities. The pressures of an expanding economy will force new approaches to old problems and the economies and efficiencies of water and rail service should not be overlooked.

I am mainly concerned with the long-range improvements in the economy of production and distribution that could result if shippers, railroads and barge lines took a new look at rail-water coordination. With hundreds of millions more tons of traffic to carry in the next 10 years, all of us have to invest heavily in new and improved equipment this year and every year as far in the future as we can see. The businesslike question to ask about this new investment is how will that capital be most efficiently employed? Most shipments move by more than one mode. It is logical to think of the most efficient combinations.

I am personally going to ignore the long-standing hostilities between the two modes and keep on proposing "willing partner" ideas which are good business propositions for shippers, the railroads and the barges.

I am told that I will fail.

I am told that there is a national railroad conspiracy against water-rail coordination, and there is no concern for the efficient use of the nation's transport resources among railroad managements.

Maybe that is so. If you will forgive me for quoting an old cliché—I am after all from Missouri.

DEATH OF WILLIAM F. MAAG, JR., YOUNGSTOWN, OHIO

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, in the death of Mr. William F. Maag, Jr., on February 29, I have lost a highly respected friend, and the Nation has lost an outstanding and courageous journalist. For many years Mr. Maag had been the publisher and editor of the Youngstown Vindicator.

As a tribute to Mr. Maag, I ask unanimous consent that the lead article in the February 29 issue of the Vindicator be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILLIAM F. MAAG JR., EDITOR, CIVIC LEADER,
DIES

Mr. Maag had been in failing health since last fall, but did not become seriously ill until a few weeks ago.

Until very recent years, Mr. Maag was at his office every day, for long days, and took huge quantities of magazines and newspapers home to read at night. After 60 years of intensive work directing and editing The Vindicator, he finally yielded to the persuasion of his family and physicians, and agreed to restrict his schedule. He continued, however, to keep in close touch with the newspaper's operation, whether at home or in Florida, and major decisions still were taken up with him until recent weeks.

Mr. Maag was born July 26, 1883, one of six children of William F. and Elizabeth DuCasse Maag. He was the last surviving member of a family which included Mrs. W. O. Brown, Arthur DuCasse Maag, treasurer and Sunday editor of The Vindicator, Miss Eda Irene, who died as a young woman; Mathilda, who died at 9, and Carl, who died at 7. The only close relatives surviving are his niece, Miss Elizabeth M. Brown, and his nephew, William J. Brown, general manager of The Vindicator.

BEGAN IN GRADE SCHOOL

The Maag family lived on Front Street, and the head of the family was publisher of the Rundschau, a German weekly. Four years after Mr. Maag was born, his father bought The Youngstown Vindicator, then a weekly newspaper.

Central Elementary School, later known as Front Street School, on the southeast corner of Front and Phelps streets, was where he began his education—and his journalistic career. While still a pupil there, he edited "The Historian," a small brochure containing articles about Queen Victoria, Peter Cooper, Greece, Turkey and other subjects.

Going on to Rayen School, Mr. Maag came under the influence of such teachers as Sarah J. Peterson, Lida Baldwin, and Philippina Kerwer. In November 1899, while a junior, he launched the Rayen Record, a monthly magazine which still is published, although the magazine format was dropped in 1926. He was its first editor, with Robert McGowan as his assistant and Joseph R. Truesdale as business manager.

As editor of the Record, Mr. Maag set the tone of his editorial career, for he promised in his first issue that no pains would be spared to make each issue a good one, and each would be better. He campaigned for showers for the athletic team and offered prizes for those who identified the lines in a Shakespearean anagram devised by Mrs. Peterson. He got articles on current events.

Along with editing the Record, Mr. Maag managed the Rayen baseball team of 1901.

Upon Mr. Maag's graduation from Rayen in 1901, James L. Wick Jr. succeeded him as editor. That fall, Wick got a long letter from Harvard University, where Mr. Maag took time out from his freshman studies to send him suggestions about improving the Record.

COULD SET TYPE

Mr. Maag was graduated from Harvard, magna cum laude, in 1905, and returned for graduate work in 1905 and 1906, though he did not take his master's degree until 1915.

During the summers of his school years, and in spare hours while in high school, Mr. Maag spent much time in the offices and plant of The Vindicator, by that time a growing daily newspaper. He learned to set type and became familiar with the mechanical

operations, as well as learning how news was handled. Upon completing his work at Harvard, he returned to The Vindicator as a reporter.

William F. Maag Sr. was essentially a business man, and looked to his son to take on more and more responsibility in the editorial department. William F. Maag Jr. became managing editor shortly after World War I, and retained that title until his father's death in April, 1924, when he became general manager. Upon the retirement of the late Frederick A. Douglas in 1936, Mr. Maag became editor as well as general manager. His title, after the death of Justice John H. Clarke, in 1945, was editor and publisher. After the death of his brother-in-law, William O. Brown, in 1956, he also became president of The Vindicator Printing Co.

RETIRING DISPOSITION

Tall and slim, Mr. Maag was a familiar figure downtown and at meetings of public interest, but so retiring of disposition that he preferred to be in the background. Even when sending memos to his subordinates, he often signed them merely "m"—not a capital letter. If he were in a picture taken for newspaper use, at some public event, he frequently maneuvered himself into an end position, where he could "crop" himself out when the photo was made into an engraving for publication.

For most of his career, Mr. Maag worked at a desk in a corner of the news room, where he was in instant touch with everything, and where he was accessible to everyone. In 1937, when The Vindicator moved into its present building, with a large office for the editor, Mr. Maag was not happy at being cut off from the staff, and his office door was open to anyone. On one morning, in fact, he arranged to have it opened before his arrival, so a copy girl could look at a TV program which had her excited.

The Mahoning Valley Industrial Management Association presented a citation and a medallion to him in 1954 for "50 years of making the Mahoning Valley industrial region a better place in which to work and live."

Mr. Maag was called the city's first citizen and a great benefactor when the Mahoning Valley Historical Society honored him on his 80th birthday, in 1963. On the same occasion, the members of the editorial staff held an informal party for him in the news room, with a huge cake decorated in the form of the front page of The Vindicator, with his picture.

In the same summer, Gov. James Rhodes praised his work on behalf of Youngstown University, saying "Youngstown is blessed by having a great editor." The Eastern Orthodox Men's Club honored him in 1964 for his "devoted service to the Mahoning Valley community."

In his own plant, Mr. Maag held honorary membership in the International Pressmen's and Assistants Union, and in the Stereotypers and Electrotypers' Local 112.

FOUGHT FOR CANAL

Waterway transportation for Youngstown was one of the causes which he held most important. He devoted great quantities of space in The Vindicator to supporting projects to meet this need, either in the form of a Lake Erie-Ohio River canal, or the Beaver-Mahoning project which at one time seemed to have a good chance of realization. He served on committees for these projects, and at a time which seemed critical to the success of the Beaver-Mahoning plan, he sent the late Ernest N. Nemenyi, Vindicator industrial editor, to Washington for the better part of three years, to carry on a personal campaign.

Mr. Maag served on the Chamber of Commerce committee whose efforts led to establishing Youngstown Municipal Airport.

Other gifts to the public which were little publicized included the donation of the land

for the armory on Miller Street, and donating the site of Boardman Township Park.

The paper continued to grow, until its daily circulation now is over 100,000; and the Sunday sale more than 155,000. The press room has been expanded twice, and even now the mechanical facilities are being taxed to keep up with growth, so that a new plant is being planned.

Mr. Maag had one complaint about the growth: it left him little personal contact with his staff. In earlier years, he knew everyone on the staff, knew their problems and the joys. He regretted that expansion prevented him from having this relationship, but he continued his interest in their welfare. His father had established an insurance program for employees in the early 1920's, and Mr. Maag expanded this program. In 1945 he set up a retirement program, and expanded this, as well, in 1960.

While guiding The Vindicator's growth, Mr. Maag was increasingly aware of the importance of radio. The Vindicator had publicized and encouraged the establishment and growth of early radio stations here, but in the mid-30s, he began to study the desirability of entering the radio field himself. In April 1938, he was granted a license for day-time operation of a 100-watt station, and WFMJ went on the air late in the summer of 1939, just as World War II erupted. Mr. Maag kept a close finger—and sharp ear—on the growth of the station. Within a few years, its license was broadened for more time and greater power, and a new transmitter was built in Boardman, near the family home, but on a site chosen primarily for technical reasons.

STATEMENT OF AFL-CIO EXECUTIVE COUNCIL EXPRESSES FULL SUPPORT FOR INTERNATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS CONFERENCE IN TEHRAN

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article, published in the March 2 edition of the AFL-CIO News, describing the union's executive board support for the 1968 International Human Rights Conference and their endorsement of the ratification of the remaining Human Rights Conventions.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"LONG OVERDUE": HUMAN RIGHTS PACTS DEMAND RATIFICATION

(Excerpted from the AFL-CIO Executive Council statement on the International Human Rights Conference adopted February 23, 1968, at Bal Harbour, Fla.)

In his formal proclamation of 1968 as Human Rights Year, Pres. Johnson emphasized that U.S. ratification of human rights treaties was long overdue. This ratification is all the more urgent because, otherwise, our government will not be able to participate effectively in the United Nations Conference on Human Rights to be held in Teheran next April.

American labor has had an unceasing interest in promoting and preserving human rights. Devoted to this course, the AFL-CIO Executive Council strives to do its utmost to help assure the success of this historic conference which marks the 20th anniversary of the proclamation of the Declaration of Human Rights by the U.N. Assembly.

The Executive Council calls upon Chairman Fulbright of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to cease all further delays in holding hearings on the ratification of the remaining human rights treaties—as strongly urged by the late Pres. Kennedy and Pres. Johnson.

The Foreign Relations Committee must realize that it is no credit to our country

that the U.S. is not one of the 71 nations which have approved the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide that was unanimously recommended, on December 9, 1948, by the UN General Assembly for ratification by member states; the U.S. is not one of the 79 nations which have approved the Convention concerning the Abolition of Forced Labor; the U.S. is not among the 76 nations which have approved the Convention on Freedom of Association; and the U.S. is not among the 55 nations which have already approved the Convention on the Political Rights of Women.

Since the American people as a whole now enjoy the rights, freedoms and standards provided by these Conventions, no member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee can at this very late date, raise the question of the so-called sanctity of states' rights as an objection to their ratification.

The Teheran Conference provides our government with a unique opportunity to take the lead in seeking concrete worldwide implementation of the International Covenant on Human Rights which was adopted by the U.N. General Assembly in December 1966. The AFL-CIO Executive Council urges our government to take the initiative in proposing that the Teheran Conference take positive steps for implementing:

Article 13(2) of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights which provides that "Everyone has the right to leave any country, including his own, and to return to his country."

Article 14(1) which provides that "Everyone has the right to seek and enjoy in other countries asylum from persecution."

The creation of more effective safeguards against the violation of human rights by establishing a Permanent UN Commission on the Preservation and Promotion of Human Rights, with authority to appoint Human Rights Observation Committees endowed with the rights and powers of investigation, surveillance and reporting.

The elimination by the UN Member States of all legal, political administrative and police barriers to the widest freedom of circulation among their peoples of all UN publications, surveys, reports and other documents acted upon by the General Assembly or any of its subdivisions.

Enforcement of effective sanctions against repressive colonialist regimes in the African territories under Portuguese and Spanish administration, in Rhodesia, and South Africa.

Preparation of a program for a more effective solution of all refugee problems (Arab and Jewish alike) by ratifying the October 4, 1967 Protocol on Refugees which enlarged the scope of the 1951 Refugee Convention.

Finally, we urge our government to include a representative of the AFL-CIO in the U.S. delegation to the Teheran Conference.

NEW PROGRAM TO INCREASE VOLUME OF U.S. EXPORTS

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, on January 1 of this year the President made some economic recommendations of which we are all very much aware. Unfortunately, I must disagree with the great mass of those recommendations. However I do applaud one particular aspect of the New Year's message, and that is the recommendation for funding a new program to increase the volume of U.S. exports. This is termed the Joint Export Association Program.

Funds to promote the sale of American exports would be channeled through joint Government/industry export associations, consisting of groups of firms or their representatives.

Assistance under this program would

be just as available to small and moderate sized businesses as it would be to more established firms. Both exporters with long-term histories of export activity and potential exporters who have not entered worldwide markets would be eligible for assistance.

The value of such a program, when viewed in relation to our continuing balance of payments problems and domestic economic considerations, is readily apparent.

For example, financial assistance would be available for advertising and publicity abroad including participation in international trade fairs, market research, travel connected with international promotion activities, training of personnel and operation abroad of certain physical facilities such as assembly and packaging facilities, showrooms, service, and warehousing facilities.

This proposal is one of the more encouraging programs which this administration has come up with. I only regret that it was not suggested before. Perhaps if it had we would not be faced with some of the grave problems which now confront us.

I urge that the Senate Appropriations Committee give full consideration to this item in the budget, and I hope it will reach a favorable decision.

TILTING THE WINDMILL

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, every great city of any size is always endowed with an iconoclastic journalist whose mission in the city it is to debunk the cherished, the sacred, the revered, and the respected, including politicians, clergymen and three-footed infelders.

Seattle is no exception.

For more than two decades, Ed Donohoe, the sharp-witted columnist for the Washington Teamster has been "tilting the windmill" always seeking to put local people and events in a different perspective. His often barbed weekly observations are awaited with mixed feelings of anticipation and trepidation by thousands of readers around the State of Washington.

Recently, Don Duncan, columnist of the Seattle Times, drew a delightful profile of Ed Donohoe; one which I believe many people will enjoy reading.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that Duncan's article be reprinted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TILTING THE WINDMILL

The column is entitled, "Tilting the Windmill." The author, Ed Donohoe, is a balding, slightly paunchy man who has built a reputation as the most vitriolic writer in the Pacific Northwest.

Every Friday, The Washington Teamster, vehicle for Donohoe's acid-dipped typewriter, lands in the hands of 51,000 subscribers and 2,000 "courtesy list" recipients. As such it is the largest-circulation weekly in the state. Certainly it is one of the best-read publications anywhere.

Donohoe tilts at windmills most newspapermen wouldn't touch with one of Don Quixote's ten-foot poles. He is Quixotic by nature, but he sees a difference.

"Don Quixote was always falling. I like to feel that I hit a lot of guys where it hurts."

Politicians, judges, industrialists, physi-

cians can attest that Donohoe has a rare instinct for the jugular. Indeed, they quickly scan Donohoe's column each week to see if their names are mentioned. If not, they settle back and chuckle over the crisply thrown jabs "the other guy" is absorbing.

The back-alley brawler who leads with his typewriter no longer is common in journalism. So, in a way, Donohoe is one of the last of a breed. He works in a cluttered office in the basement of the Teamster Building, 552 Denny Way, spinning around in his swivel chair to answer the telephone a few feet from his desk, propping his feet on the desk and toying with a toothpick when he talks informally.

When he turns to his vintage Royal typewriter, he cackles or giggles with glee. His speech, too, is punctuated by these hard-to-describe outbursts. Maybe Brutus sounded like that while he was slipping the knife into Caesar.

Donohoe says of his writing, "I try to overpower the facts." And he adds, "I've been wrong . . . in fact, I can't understand why people get so disturbed."

But disturbed they do get. Men have "gone looking" for Donohoe. He has been dissected on the airwaves. He has been airily dismissed as nothing more than a public scold. Some, he says, "measure me for a box or go whining" to a Teamster official.

All the while, of course, Donohoe is being read.

While most men, in these days of image-building and group-think, are reasonably prudent about dealing in personalities when they talk, or write, Donohoe's 27 years of faithful service to the union give him a sense of security. He starts swinging at the bell. After it, too, if he sees an opening.

Samples:

On newspapermen sticking to what they know best: "Ever see a newspaperman run for political office! Most pitiful sight in the world."

On the controversial appointment of Dan O'Donnell as 37th District legislator: "Why discriminate against Dan O'Donnell because he's white?"

On "Streetcar Charlie" Carroll, former transit man and long-time city councilman: "Charlie's a nice guy and a good politician, but there was a time when he couldn't find his way to the car barn."

On the medical profession: "I recently suggested we put doctors under the Department of Public Utilities, to fix their fees. Those birds are doing everything in their power to bring on socialized medicine."

Donohoe described Lloyd Cooney, television editorialist, as "an overanxious coyote." Mild compared with his saying of Irving Clark, Jr., radio talk-show personality, that they were considering naming a mountain after Clark but were having trouble finding one shaped to match his pointed head.

In Donohoe's dictionary, one finds: The Seattle Times ("Fairview Fanny"). Prosecutor Charles O. Carroll ("Faircatch Carroll").

Superior Judge Charles Z. Smith ("Zero Smith").

It was Donohoe who first called the freeway mess at the Roanoke Interchange, "Roanoke Roulette." All newspapermen who use the words now are "pirates."

Donohoe says of Judge Smith, "I didn't even know him when I first called him 'Zero.' He came up to me one day and said he had no ax to grind, but it did sort of hurt when his kids picked it up and started calling him 'Zero.' Nice guy, Judge Smith."

"And one thing you got to say for 'Faircatch Carroll,' he's direct. He eats you out, face to face."

Silence hurts Donohoe. When he hits, he likes a good counterpunch. He thrives on controversy.

"I like to see which way the wind is blowing, so I can blow against it," Donohoe says. "It is more fun knocking. Nobody would read you if you were nice all the time, like

some of those gravestone-scratcher columnists, always eulogizing. Those sentimental writers make me want to throw up.

"Most of all, I don't like the starched-collar attitude, I like humor."

Donohoe has tried hard to pattern his bite after that of one of his early mentors, the late Les Hunt, former editor of The Washington Teamster.

"Les had that great knack for breaking it off in a guy," Donohoe said admiringly.

Donohoe learned his lessons well. After finishing St. Anne's and Seattle Prep in Seattle, he attended Seattle University, St. Martin's College and the University of Washington, getting his degree at the U. W. He wasn't in journalism, though, and there was little indication of the real Donohoe behind that slat-thin, slightly dyspeptic-looking exterior.

After a brief hitch on a Seattle daily (he says he got the ax), Donohoe turned up at the Teamsters Union—22 years old and full of beans.

Those beans have been exploding ever since, making 10 times as much noise since he began his column 12 years ago.

His column-writing technique is simple. He thinks about it for two days before deadline. Then, in one frenzied burst of activity, often no more than an hour, he pounds it out—cackling or giggling when "I am really breaking it off." One draft and he's finished, "because you ruin it with all that polishing."

Donohoe's creed is to "write to entertain myself. I say to myself, 'Hey, that ought to really make the guy burn.'"

There are some regular readers of The Washington Teamster who wonder aloud if the polished, literate editorials and column of Denzil Walters, Donohoe's college-teacher assistant, and the Menckenesque writing of Donohoe aren't "over the heads of truck drivers."

"Nuts," says Donohoe. He adds that not all teamsters drive trucks, that they represent a cross-section of America. Many are extremely well educated. None is a dummy.

"Besides," Donohoe cackled, "I even confuse myself when I play with words sometimes."

Donohoe usually helps script the annual sportswriters' banquet here, a lampoon similar to the famous Gridiron Club banquet in Washington, D.C. It is a great showcase for his talents.

"Yeah," he said, "we invented the 'Soriano (Dewey) Cocktail'—on the rocks." Cackle, cackle.

Harsh? Well, consider:

Donohoe once said he'd like to see the Pike Place Market fall on Ivar's Acres of Clams, "so we can get rid of two eyesores at once."

"Ivar Haglund really loved that one."

Aiming a classic one-two at the market, Donohoe wrote, "Father, dear father, come home with me, please; you've come from the Pike Place Market and you're covered with fleas."

In those weekly cartoons in The Washington Teamsters Donohoe writes biting captions. Physicians are depicted as Midases, Gov. Dan Evans walks around with an arrow sticking through his head, asking, "Hey, has anybody seen my arrow?"

And Donohoe's personal favorite: "Ted Griffin carrying Namu on his back and approaching Mayor Braman. The caption: 'He's not heavy, Your Honor, he's my blubber.'"

Donohoe regularly pummels The Boeing Co. and the League of Women Voters. He roasted the late Cardinal Spellman. But he is quick to praise, too. Mayor Braman is "the best mayor the town ever had." County Commissioner Ed Munro is "the ideal intelligent politician." Jack Hurley, the prizefight entrepreneur, is simply "the greatest."

The telephone rang. Donohoe spun around and picked up the receiver. He listened and frowned.

"You're no more Jim Ellis (the Forward

Thruster is a frequent Donohoe target) than I am," Donohoe snarled. "Edo!"

It was, indeed, Edo Vanni, general manager of the Seattle Angels.

"Hey, Edo, saw your picture in the paper and I couldn't tell if you'd been fired or were still general manager. Get the Mafia going on it . . ."

THE NEED FOR A SECOND WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON AGING

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, the Special Subcommittee on Aging of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has begun to hold hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 117, which proposes that a White House Conference on Aging be held in 1970.

As one of the cosponsors of this resolution, I am deeply hopeful that this resolution will be thoroughly discussed, analyzed, and then favorably acted upon.

I support the purpose of Senate Joint Resolution 117 because I am convinced that the problems of today's 19 million Americans over 65 are critical and increasing. A White House Conference on Aging would provide the opportunity for leaders and experts to gather together and explore the problems that beset many of our senior citizens and to recommend possible courses of action.

The resolution that is being discussed would—

First. Authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to plan and conduct the conference with the cooperation and assistance of such other Federal departments and agencies as may be appropriate;

Second. Bring together representatives of Federal, State, and local governments, professional and lay people who are working in the field of aging, and of the general public, including older persons themselves;

Third. Authorize each State, upon application to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, not more than \$25,000 for use in planning and conducting a State conference on aging, for developing facts and recommendations and the preparation of reports, and for defraying costs incident to the State's delegates attending the White House Conference;

Fourth. Authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to establish an Advisory Committee to the Conference to advise and assist in planning and conducting the Conference;

Fifth. Require that a final report of the Conference be submitted to the President not later than 90 days following the date on which the Conference was called.

Mr. President, the value and benefits to be gained by such a conference far surpasses the small investment of Federal funds needed to implement Senate Joint Resolution 117.

The White House Conference would provide the opportunity to develop future programs and to improve current programs for our senior citizens.

It would provide a basis for the leaders and experts in the field to come together to exchange ideas, evaluate current programs and make recommendations for new programs.

The Conference would make it desirable for each State to define its particu-

lar needs and to give prompt attention to present and potential problems.

As one who has worked for the passage of several major recommendations made at the 1961 White House Conference on Aging, I am pleased with the progress that has been made to date, but I am also convinced that a thorough review of our approach to the problems of our senior citizens must be evaluated.

As a member of the Senate Special Committee on Aging, I am well aware of the magnitude of the problems facing the elderly and the extent of our Government's commitment to meet these problems.

The great advances being made in the field of medicine and public health have increased the number of elder Americans to over 19 million. It is estimated that the year 2000 will see over 28 million Americans in the senior citizen category. This rapid increase in the number of older Americans requires much planning on the part of public officials in order that the elders of our society may be accommodated.

In February of 1963, President Kennedy eloquently expressed the concern that we must have for our senior citizens when he declared:

It is not enough for a great nation merely to have added new years to life—our objective must also be to add new life to those years.

And may I add, our responsibility and duty to our senior Americans have not changed.

We must meet the challenge of being compassionate and respectful to our elders—too many of whom have been left behind by the progress and change they worked most of their lives to bring about. They cannot and must not be forsaken.

In our busy and productive society, many of our senior citizens have been relegated to lead empty, lonesome, and neglected lives: 5.3 million older Americans have annual incomes below the poverty level; only 1 out of 5 has a job, usually at low wages; over 2 million elderly citizens are on welfare; nearly 40 percent of our single older citizens have total assets of less than \$1,000.

It is a sad but true picture that many of our senior citizens dwell in city and rural slums—lonely and forgotten, isolated from the invigorating spirit of "young" America on the move.

We are constantly being reminded that our country is getting younger—that half of our citizens are under 25 years of age. Regardless of the fact that the spotlight is focused on the American youth, we cannot afford to ignore either the problems or the vast potential of our senior citizens.

The stereotype concept of the elderly in our society has been one where the aged are supposed to be enjoying their retirement years. Unfortunately, this stereotype picture ignores several important facts.

It ignores the hardship faced by the poor who are forced to supplement their inadequate income with whatever they can find.

It ignores the fact that many of our senior citizens are forced to live lonely years with no continuing contact with society.

And it ignores the frustration of the aged, many of whom can and want to continue to produce and make further contributions to our society—an asset we can ill afford to waste.

A White House Conference, as envisioned by Senate Joint Resolution 117, would go far to create a new concept of the status and role of the older American—a new type of senior citizen.

More and more today's group of elder citizens represents a vast reservoir of talent, skills, and "youth." Compulsory early retirement has given rise to a new kind of older American—strong, healthy, talented, and eager to continue giving.

Since many people are retired in regard only to chronological age, each year tens of thousands are added to the retired group who the previous year held responsible and productive jobs.

There is no doubt in my mind that "young" Americans want to remain in the mainstream of life. They need society to demonstrate that it has further use for their services and wants them to continue to play a dynamic and active role.

Being useful, many times, marks the difference between just existing and living with meaning.

Mr. President, I strongly support Senate Joint Resolution 117. I think our senior citizens require and deserve the attention and study that only a White House Conference on Aging can bring about.

A CONTINUING DIALOG

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, over the last several months there has been a great deal of discussion of national priorities and Government spending, about leadership within our country and by our country. In this regard, there has perhaps been no single more meaningful contribution to this discussion than the report issued this past weekend by the President's Commission on Civil Disorders.

There were statements included with which some of us would differ. There were omissions made that some of us would have included.

But the report offers great potential in contributing to the solution of our urban problems, and perhaps its greatest value lies in the dialog the Commission hopes to stimulate among all citizens.

Millions of Americans read excerpts of the report in their Sunday newspapers, and millions more watched the beginning of what I hope will be a continuing dialog on their television sets Sunday afternoon. I would like to request that the transcript of a part of the opening round of discussions be inserted into the RECORD at this point. It is an extract from the transcript of the "Face the Nation" program which had as its special guest, the distinguished mayor of New York, John Lindsay, Vice Chairman of the Commission. I hope that the remarks of the able mayor of the city of New York will provoke further discussion and comment among those interested in finding effective and innovative solutions to our urban problems.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. NOVAK. Turning to the Riot Commission report, Mayor Lindsay, do you—what is the price tag on this report and what chance do you think there is of the Congress accepting it?

Mayor LINDSAY. The report sets a very high goal for the Nation. The Commission chose to put that goal in terms of a program: housing, jobs, needs of education, discussion of the bankrupt welfare system in the country. The Commission chose to discuss those in broad terms, setting a very high goal in the units of housing that are needed, the numbers of jobs that are required to be supplied to the poor and those who are trapped in the ghettos, and did not put a price tag on it. Undoubtedly, it will be costly, but Americans have risen to challenges each time they have arisen. The Congress rose to the challenge of the conquering of space when it was put to the Congress, and the Congress can and ought to rise to this one.

Mr. NOVAK. Now Congressman Mahon, of Texas, the Chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, is going to have a lot to say about how much or how little this is implemented, says that very little of it is going to be implemented. And, he says, that this is just going to—the mere issuance of these recommendations are just going to cause rising expectations that cannot be satisfied and increase the danger of riots. What do you think about that?

Mayor LINDSAY. As a former member of Congress, which I was for seven years, and now as a Mayor, I think I can speak as a realist in this area. And most Congressmen are realists, too, including my former colleague, Congressman Mahon, for whom I have the highest regard. But the fact is that the Congress must lead and the country must push the Congress. Both must happen, and unless it happens we're in for trouble. The way things are going now, an average ghetto community of the twenty-four major cities across the country that the Riot Commission examined with care, you will find that two out of three Negroes in those ghetto areas are jobless or underemployed through no fault of their own, that over 50 per cent of the young men can expect to be dropouts from the school system, that two out of three can look forward to an entire lifetime trapped in the welfare system, which is costly to everyone. The cost of inaction in this area will far outstrip the cost of taking positive realist action which the Congress has got to do.

Mr. AGRONSKY. Mayor Lindsay, let's talk about the cost of action. You once made an observation, I believe, that it would cost \$50 billion to implement over five years even a half-adequate program to deal with this problem. I believe you estimated it would cost \$5 billion for New York City alone to deal with the problem. You were Vice Chairman of the Commission, was no price tag put on this?

Mayor LINDSAY. You know, just take one area—New York City. Over a ten-year period, the taxpayers of New York put \$1 billion of their own money in transportation alone. That is our contribution, out of one municipality. We're not talking about something that is going to kill the country. Over a five-year period we put \$18 billion into highways alone, another \$18 to \$20 billion into the space program. Is this country going to say that it is impossible to correct the cancer that exists in the center of these cities, fifty of which rioted last summer, by an expenditure of funds that are needed and which are modest in comparison, as I said, with the cost of this.

Mr. AGRONSKY. Why did you not say how much is needed so that the country would know what we're talking about?

Mayor LINDSAY. The Commission chose not to attempt to put a price tag on it, for several reasons: One, some of the areas of discussion in the Commission report, such as the junking of the welfare system and substituting something far more realistic and better

and productive, such as income supplements for the poor, those who cannot get a decent living through no fault of their own, or underemployed through no fault of their own—and economists can debate endlessly the cost of some of these things. In the job area, we're talking about a massive involvement of the private sector, with some help by way of subsidies or tax credits from the federal government. In housing, we're talking about massive assistance to the private sector to reduce the costs of housing and to lower the costs of interest payments. And you can debate endlessly the cost of it. It will be costly. And I think that the country has got to make up its mind, and the Congress must make up its mind, that the cost figure is relatively unimportant in terms of what we have to do in order to save this country from the possibility of chaos.

Mr. DEAN. Mr. Mayor, is it your view that the—it is a very basic question—that these programs can be implemented while the Nation's energies and monies are committed so heavily in South Vietnam?

Mayor LINDSAY. Well, once again—first, let me talk about the Commission. The Commission chose not to compare what has to be done in these cities with space, Europe, NATO, Vietnam, or any other national or international commitment. It simply said here is the problem. It is massive, and the country must mount programs to meet that problem that is equal to the problem. And my own view is that the country could do it. I believe very strongly that the country must and should.

Mr. AGRONSKY. Mayor Lindsay, obviously one cannot really contemplate or try to figure out the way to work out these recommendations of the Commission in a vacuum, you must relate it to our foreign policy, you must relate it to the problem of Vietnam. Clearly, you were aware of this. Did you raise this with President Johnson?

Mayor LINDSAY. Well, the Commission's report is a report to the President and to the country and the Commission simply says that, after describing the nature of the condition of these cities, it simply says that, as a matter of survival, there can be no higher priority than the mobilization of national resources to fight the problem in the cities. And I think that the tone of the Commission's report to the President and to the country is that the country must do this in order to survive.

Mr. AGRONSKY. But was there no opportunity on the part of the Commission to talk to the President before the public issuance of the report?

Mayor LINDSAY. Well, it was not expected of anyone. The President of the United States gave this Commission, last August, a charter. It was an executive order signed by the President. And the President said to the Commission that he appointed and brought into his office at that time, said "I want you to tell the country what happened in the summer of 1967, why did it happen and what should be done to stop it from happening again." And we went through, each of us, I think, a personal ordeal, for seven months, in working together in rolled-up sleeves inside meetings with ourselves and then out on the streets and in the cities, personal visits by members of the Commission to these cities that had had riots, and intensive work by staffs and by experts.

Mr. AGRONSKY. Has the President indicated—

Mayor LINDSAY. And then we put together our findings in very difficult debate among ourselves and produced a unanimous report. All Commissioners signed it and now it is before the President and before the country.

Mr. DEAN. There is a view that is heard all over the country that perhaps the panel is rewarding, rather than chastizing the rioters, by offering these programs, recommending these programs.

Mayor LINDSAY. That is a very negative view, I think. I certainly cannot agree with

it. That is a view that seems to say that the majority of Negroes in these communities that have had great depression and have existed with these ghetto conditions that have been growing up through the decades of inaction, seems to say that this is what all Negroes want.

Mr. NOVAK. Well, Mayor Lindsay—

Mayor LINDSAY. It is not true. The findings of the Commission are very clear that the majority and the vast majority of Negroes who live in these segregated and poverty stricken neighborhoods and these cities look forward to tranquility, to peace, but expect that the world at large will assist them in breaking out of the conditions in which they live. They cannot do it alone and it does require national action.

Mr. NOVAK. Mayor Lindsay, on this question of condoning violence, there is a statement in the report that suggests that "open defiance of law and federal authority by State and local officials resisting desegregation" has contributed to the lawlessness and the violence in the ghetto. Do you mean that places like Detroit and Newark, that there was lawlessness and violation of federal authority by the local officials?

Mayor LINDSAY. It is absolutely true, that violations of standards of conduct that have heretofore been laid down by Congress has been ignored very often by officialdom.

Mr. NOVAK. What violations—

Mayor LINDSAY. And it is largely true that white society in general has condoned a whole series of dreadful conditions to grow up over the years in these ghetto communities. The Commission was very clear—and let me be clear about this, too—in stating that lawlessness and violence in the streets cannot be tolerated and will not be tolerated, and that every necessary step will be taken to control it, and that when crimes occur in the streets they will be prosecuted. The Commission was clear also in stating that we are never going to solve this problem if we don't get at the root causes, and amongst the root causes is a whole history in the United States of poverty and segregation, and under this our attitudes on race that have grown up and have persisted, and we have got to get on with the job of breaking this down.

Mr. NOVAK. What flaunting of federal—going back to the specific question, Mr. Mayor—what flaunting of federal authority was there in Detroit where there was a very bad riot? Where did Mayor Cavanagh resist desegregation?

Mayor LINDSAY. The Commission is not talking about and did not even attempt to describe instances A, B, C, and D. The Commission does say that the national law in this country, and in most states and in most cities, the local law is that there cannot be discrimination. When a person seeks to get better housing or a person wishes better schooling, if that person happens to be a Negro, if there is federal or public monies involved in the housing or in the schooling or in whatever it happens to be, that law should be enforced. The law has never really been enforced. And it may be—I don't know—it may be that it comes close to being impossible to enforce it a hundred per cent, but there has not been strict enough enforcement, which has been a problem.

Mr. AGRONSKY. Mayor Lindsay—

Mayor LINDSAY. I don't think, however, if I may conclude that thought—and I think each Commissioner would feel the same way—that enforcement of criminal law is the answer. You have got to get, once again, down to the root problem, which is bad housing, deteriorated school systems in these cities, and joblessness.

Mr. AGRONSKY. Mayor Lindsay, there is another facet of the root problem, the bad housing, the deterioration of the cities and all that, it requires money to correct. You have said repeatedly in the past—and I would presume that you expressed this point of view when you were deliberating in the Commis-

sion—that we must reassess our commitments, our foreign policy commitments, our space commitments, if we are to deal with this problem. Now, the President has made it very clear that he is going to cut back and has cut back, indeed, in a number of his recommendations on dealing with the problems of the cities, because of the needs of Vietnam and defense and all the rest. Now, can we deal with both? Will the President deal with both? Does the Commission in any way have any idea how the President will react to this report?

Mayor LINDSAY. Well, I think that the Commission, and I as the Vice Chairman of the Commission, have done what we think is right. And I do hope that the Commission report, which says very clearly that there can be no higher priority than the mobilization of national resources and national will to cure the disease of the cities—I do hope it will have an impact. And that is why I said earlier that I think that candidates for national office, members of Congress and others, ought to address themselves specifically to what I think is the high goal that is laid down for the Nation in this report.

Mr. AGRONSKY. Do you feel the priorities are wrong?

Mayor LINDSAY. I personally think that there should be a reorientation of our priorities in the country. I believe that the sickness of our cities is as much an important part of our foreign policy as are events that happen beyond our borders. The image and look of this country abroad is just as important as the quality of our ambassadors in a particular embassy or any other aspects of foreign policy.

Mr. DEAN. Mr. Lindsay, one section of the report deals with the news coverage in ghetto areas, and all of us constantly hear admonitions that television should stay away from problem areas, that we have an incendiary effect in troubled areas of our cities. What is the Commission's view?

Mayor LINDSAY. The Commission's view is that mass media on the whole attempted to be constructive and affirmative in reporting honestly and factually the condition of the cities, riot conditions and riots when they occurred. The Commission finds also that mass media ought to take a look at itself, its own knowledge and information about what a ghetto is all about and what happens there on a twenty-four hour, weekly, yearly basis. The Commission found that there were instances from time to time of erroneous reporting or very fast, too fast repeating of rumors that turned out later to be false, thereby contributing to atmospheric conditions that were very bad indeed. The Commission recommended that mass media voluntarily examine itself and voluntarily create an institute for better exchange of information, training, technology, and all the rest. Speaking for myself and our own experience in New York, fortunately we had two peaceful summers in New York City, in the last two summers. Mass media played a role. Mass media in New York City was constructive, cooperated with the Mayor's Summer Task Force in the things that we are trying to do to keep it cool, things like the use of lights at night by television crews, the reporting of rumors. In New York City we had cooperation from the news media on that, with some exceptions. But on the whole it was good.

Mr. NOVAK. Mayor Lindsay, your report, the Commission report criticizes excessive use of force in riots, and it says—it condemns what it calls moves to equip police departments with mass destruction weapons. What are you talking about there? What police forces in what communities have been stockpiling mass destruction weapons?

Mayor LINDSAY. What weapons—the Commission chose very carefully not to go into any specific community and to describe in detail what weapons are being discussed, except three: tanks, machine guns, and high-powered single-action rifles.

Mr. AGRONSKY. You would—

Mr. NOVAK. Well, doesn't—

Mayor LINDSAY. And the Commission said very flatly that in crowded urban centers, if there is civil disorder, it must be controlled and control weapons are not these. Those are weapons of basic destruction. The Commission made that finding very flatly and very positively. And I think it is right. I agree with it.

Mr. NOVAK. You would not use tanks in New York City if a riot broke out of serious proportions this summer or any other time?

Mayor LINDSAY. No, sir.

Mr. NOVAK. Don't you think that this deprives the police, possibly, of a deterrent, of a question not of using it but of deterring riot action?

Mayor LINDSAY. I do not, I do not. Our effort in New York City is like the effort made by one of the members of the Riot Commission, the Police Chief of Atlanta, Herbert Jenkins. Our effort and his effort, and I believe of a great many other police commissioners and mayors in other cities, is to plan for civil order in our towns by positive police action and meaningful involvement of the total government and of the non-government, citizens and the neighborhoods. The Commission report recommends neighborhood city halls, which we're doing in New York. It recommends urban task forces, which we are doing in New York. The Commission report says very flatly that one of the problems is that the police office in the ghetto area receives the total burden on his shoulders for all of the hostilities and resentments of the community against authority. And why should the policeman have to carry that load? It ought to be shared by the total community.

Mr. AGRONSKY. Mayor Lindsay, I regret we are out of time. Thank you very much for being here to face the Nation.

ANNOUNCER. Today, on "Face the Nation," Mayor John Lindsay, of New York City, was interviewed by CBS News Correspondent Morton Dean, Robert Novak, Columnist for the Chicago Sun-Times Syndicate, CBS News Correspondent Martin Agronsky led the questioning.

RETRAINING INACTIVE HEALTH PERSONNEL

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, in his recent message on health in America, President Johnson outlined a 12-point "mobilization for health program." One aspect of this proposed program is the effective use of military health personnel leaving the armed services. Similar efforts could effectively be applied to the recruiting of inactive civilian health workers who could be returned to the health field through recruitment and retraining.

This is especially true of the females who, because of marriages and pregnancies, decided to devote their lives to their husbands and children. For many of them, their children are now in school or married. These mothers now have the time, or the real desire, to work again. The number of women in this category is large. In one heavily populated eastern seaboard State it is estimated that there are 10,000 inactive medical technologists. If only a small portion of them could be encouraged to return to work, the medical technology manpower shortage of that State could be appreciably reduced. This situation also exists for physical therapists, occupational therapists, and probably is the most common with nurses.

These inactive health workers all realize that after an absence from their

former jobs they need brief retraining to bring them up to date. Many are dissuaded from this retraining because it would involve a financial burden that they cannot afford. For those who have preschool children and must seek employment, the problem is compounded; for it would require babysitters while they are retraining, and after that while they are working.

Mr. President, it appears crucial that every effort be made to encourage these inactive health workers to return, if they are able, to active careers. These individuals represent a tremendous inert resource of health manpower. They should, and must be provided the incentives to become active practitioners.

I have previously indicated my own intention of introducing legislation to stimulate the development of retraining programs for inactive health personnel, and I welcome the support of the administration for this important work. We must all strive to alleviate the health manpower shortage, and this is one effective way of doing so.

WHITHER THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the United States should reaffirm its support of the political and social reforms called for by the Alliance for Progress, and should disengage itself from too intimate association with governments in power, particularly authoritarian governments.

These are the principal conclusions of the senior Senator from Tennessee from a 19-day trip through five countries of South America—Venezuela, Brazil, Argentina, Chile, and Peru. The visitor, a first-time visitor in this case, is struck by contrasts—in resources, geography, people, traditions, economies, and political systems. But one is also struck by several recurring themes. These are perhaps best expressed as a series of opposites: Democratic versus authoritarian governments, reforms versus tradition, U.S. influence versus U.S. overinvolvement in domestic affairs, military control versus civilian control, stable economic growth versus inflation, the U.S. balance of payments versus the Latin American balance of payments, economic integration versus economic nationalism, and agriculture versus urbanization.

These dilemmas call for reexamination of U.S. policies—the objectives of the United States in Latin America, the appropriate means to achieve those objectives, and the price that must be paid in political as well as economic terms. The urgency of such a reexamination is increased by the diversion of U.S. resources and energies to Vietnam and by the necessity to correct the imbalance of U.S. international payments.

Although one encounters a few complaints, Latin American officials generally accept the fact that the U.S. involvement in Vietnam dictates lower levels of economic assistance. Many of these officials say privately that they understand and sympathize with, or even support, the U.S. position in Vietnam, but they are unwilling to say this publicly because, as they explain, public opinion in their countries would be adverse to it. More than aid, officials in the countries

covered by this report are interested in political support, and in trade concessions or preference.

Of the countries visited on this trip, Venezuela, Chile, and Peru have democratic, popularly elected governments. Brazil and Argentina are governed by authoritarian regimes. The United States is identified with all of them.

To many Latin Americans, this appears to be a willingness on our part to support just any government that is not Communist. It at least raises the question of whether we really mean our many statements in favor of democracy, or so it seemed to this visitor.

Domestic government, good or bad, is preeminently a task for Latin Americans themselves, and there is frustratingly little that the United States can do about it. Nonrecognition of authoritarian or unconstitutional regimes is not an effective policy. The United States cannot very well indefinitely ignore the existence of a country as important as Brazil or Argentina, whatever its form of government. But there is a difference between maintaining correct diplomatic relations with a government and publicly identifying oneself as sympathetic.

The Alliance for Progress is a program of reform, calling for far-reaching changes in social structures, economic policies, and class relationships. Many of these go to the heart of the established order. They are painful to many of the Latin American upper class, and for this reason they are encountering stubborn resistance. The United States is again called upon either to act like it means what it has been saying or to reconsider its stated policies.

Nowhere is this dilemma greater than with respect to land reform. Comprehensive land reform involves a great many things—redistribution of land, credit, technical assistance, price policies, rural roads, marketing arrangements, among others. But most importantly it involves changes in land tenure arrangements. Two percent of the landholders in Peru for instance, own 75 percent of the land. In Chile and in other countries there are many, many families who try to exist in extremely marginal circumstances. The problem of tenure, then, is essentially one of redistribution. The greatest political and social need is the conversion of traditional peons into productive, responsible citizens. This appears imperative, survival of democracy requiring it.

Given the resources available to the Governments of Chile and Peru, it is unlikely that this can be done in any reasonable time period unless there is resort to expropriation without, at least in many cases, full and effective compensation. Inevitably, also, there are going to be cases of inefficiency, waste, and misallocated resources. Quite apart from the opposition of the landholding class, land reform is an enormously complicated undertaking involving the uprooting of centuries of tradition. It may even mean less production, at least for the short run.

In evaluating Latin American land-reform programs, it would be a mistake to apply U.S. standards and legal traditions, even subconsciously. The Chilean

and Peruvian land reforms are being carried out within the framework of different systems of law, and different legal and social traditions. The protection of the landholder written into the laws of both countries appears adequate. This, indeed, is the main reason the programs are moving so slowly in both countries.

It needs to be remembered that, at least in Peru, some of the large landholdings have come down more or less intact from the original grants of the Spanish crown—grants which consisted of a given number of hectares and Indians to go with the land. Furthermore, land in Peru is not taxed.

Finally, it needs to be remembered that the Latin Americans whom North Americans most frequently meet are from the upper class, many of whom feel betrayed by U.S. support of the Alliance for Progress. This is a natural phenomenon, because it is the upper-class Latin Americans who have the money to travel to the United States and who have business connections with U.S. banks and corporations. It is upper-class Latin Americans who speak English, who live in neighborhoods congenial to North Americans, and who are most likely to meet transient North Americans. This relationship is likely to give a distorted picture to North Americans who are not on their guard against it.

In almost every place visited on this trip, the United States appeared much involved in the country's internal affairs. In part, this has been deliberate; in part, inadvertent. In part, it has been by the U.S. Government; in part, by private enterprise and other nongovernmental institutions. This stems from friendship and a desire to be helpful, but also from a desire for non-Communist political regimes.

One of the most striking things to a first-time visitor to South America is the pervasive U.S. presence. In Venezuela, this takes the form of private investment. Caracas, for instance, is aglow at night with electric signs advertising Sears, Roebuck stores, Sherwin Williams paints, Singer sewing machines, American automobiles, Coca-Cola soft drinks. And aside from these consumer products, there is the overwhelming fact of U.S. dominance in oil and iron in Venezuela. In Chile and Peru it is copper.

For both political and economic reasons, U.S. policy in Latin America has long emphasized the need to attract foreign private investment. Economic development through private, rather than public, investment is more in accord with U.S. traditions. Further, there are insufficient public funds with which to do the job in the absence of private investment.

But this has a political price, even in countries such as Venezuela where the climate for private investment is generally good. This price is that Latin Americans, although welcoming the fruits of private investment, tend to get a little uneasy that the resources and the economies of their countries may be gradually slipping away from them. A Brazilian spoke of his people's desire to protect their industries from what he called denationalization. This is a natural reaction of people, particularly nationalistic people, who see most of their resources and industries owned by foreigners. It

counsels a policy of restraint on the part of the U.S. Government and U.S. business in pushing too hard for more private investment or for more favorable conditions for private investment. At the same time, one must recognize that a slowdown in private investment means a slowdown in both Latin American economic development and in the supply of Latin American raw resources for U.S. industry. One possible way to ameliorate, if not to solve, the problem might be for U.S. firms to operate more through joint ventures, several notable examples of which one can now find.

Aside from the problem of U.S. private business, the U.S. Government presence in Latin America, generally speaking, appears too large. Embassies, AID missions, and military groups appear swollen. This is both cause and effect of a too-intimate involvement in the internal affairs of the countries in question. Because in the beginning we wanted to get more involved—because we wanted to help cooperative governments reorganize their systems of tax collection or education or agriculture or military training—we expanded the military groups and the technical assistance component of the AID missions. Technical assistance by definition means technicians. And in recent years, they have increasingly been working in administrative jobs within government ministries. Further, as techniques of foreign aid have become more sophisticated and complicated through the use of program loans—that is, loans designed to finance selected capital goods imports with the local currency proceeds going into high priority local programs—the degree of U.S. involvement in the country's budgetary and fiscal processes has inevitably grown. This, in turn, has meant that public identification of the United States with the policies of a particular government has also grown. It means, for example, that the United States is widely blamed, perhaps almost as much as the Government of Brazil, for the fact that real wages in Brazil are lower now than in 1964. Yet continuance of this trend would indicate explosive conditions.

Fortunately, there are some efforts to disengage. The U.S. Ambassador to Brazil, for instance, has begun to reduce U.S. Government personnel in Brazil. The Department of Defense is in the process of reducing U.S. military personnel—in some countries by as much as one-third. In still other countries conscious efforts are being made to open or preserve political options for the United States.

These cutbacks will be made at the cost of losing some specific opportunities to influence Latin-American government policies; but it is hard to see how they can fail to improve the overall position of the United States. This is true across the board, but especially with respect to the military groups. The U.S. military has long argued that its presence in Latin America gives the U.S. Government a source of influence on Latin American military establishments. But very few instances were cited in support of this argument. The more common result, one is led to believe, has

been that the Latin Americans have influenced the U.S. military, rather than the other way around.

In every country visited, the military establishment is a political force, ranging from minor in Chile to nearly total in Argentina. This fact is closely related to the problem of authoritarian versus democratic governments discussed above. The military is essentially an antidemocratic force, and the authoritarian governments are those dominated by the military. The political power of the military is also related to the problem of military expenditures and their impact on economic development.

If one concludes that the stated U.S. policy of support for democratic forces in Latin America is a correct one, then it follows that one must view military government and military influence on civilian governments with disfavor. U.S. policy has generally been directed toward efforts to charge the Latin-American military through training programs, through personal contacts between United States and Latin American military officers, through orientation tours in the United States, through promotion of civic action programs, and through the supply of military equipment. All of these things have been designed to make the Latin American military more professional and less political. There is little evidence that they have had significant success. Where the Latin American military has a tradition of professionalism, as in Chile, or where substantial progress has been made in subjecting it to civilian control, as in Venezuela, this has been the result of Chilean and Venezuelan—not United States—efforts.

Perhaps it is but natural for a U.S. citizen to think that the primary role of the Latin American military ought to be limited to maintaining internal security. The United States cannot enforce this limitation on the Latin Americans, but it can enforce it on its own military programs in Latin America. Insofar as they are related to internal security, civic action programs are useful if expertly carried out, because they help to create a political base for the government among the peasantry and to make it more difficult for guerrillas to win peasant support.

In countries with large primitive, non-Spanish-speaking populations, such as Peru, the military also performs a useful secondary function of contributing to the cultural integration of the society. Army recruits are taught hygiene, taught to speak Spanish, to think of themselves as Peruvians, and they may even be taught a useful civilian skill—carpentry, auto mechanics, et cetera—which enables them to contribute to the economic life of the country after their military service. The utility of this training in civilian skills is not, of course, limited to countries such as Peru, but it could probably be done more cheaply and quickly through civilian schools.

Perhaps the most acute current problem of military policy in Latin America has to do with sales of sophisticated equipment, particularly supersonic aircraft. The problem arises because of the drive within the Latin American military

forces for modernization of their equipment. U.S. policy has been to delay this process as long as possible. This policy has met with only partial success, partly because of the political power of the military and partly because European governments and manufacturers, the French in particular, are conducting a strong sales drive for aircraft and tanks. Peru reportedly has already signed an agreement to buy Mirage aircraft, and Brazil may follow suit.

From the point of view of economic development, it appears most unfortunate that Latin America is spending scarce resources on the purchase of supersonic aircraft which serve only as expensive playthings for air force officers. From the point of view of social justice and morality, it is outrageous that money would be squandered on such items when so many people are half starving in pitiful shacks. If the Latin Americans want to do this, and if the French want to lend themselves to it, there is nothing we can do about it. But we do not have to be a part of it ourselves.

It is true that Latin American military forces by and large have obsolete equipment and that if the air forces, for example, are going to be modernized, there is scarcely anything less than supersonic available to them. This dodges the question of why Latin Americans need fighter-bomber air forces at all. Such forces are useless for counterinsurgency or civic action. They are good only for fighting each other, and there are still enough national rivalries in Latin America that the acquisition of sophisticated equipment by one country leads to its acquisition by a second and a third. Indeed, the United States bears a considerable share of the responsibility for the current situation. A U.S. sale of A-4 aircraft to Argentina in 1966 led, at least in part, to a Chilean purchase of British Hawker Hunters and this in turn led, at least in part, to the Peruvian purchase of Mirages. Thus, a useless, expensive, even dangerous, armament race is generated and fed.

The question remains as to what the United States does about the factual situation which now exists. The Congress has expressed itself on this in both the foreign aid authorization and appropriation acts for the current fiscal year through provisions requiring the reduction or termination of U.S. economic assistance to Latin American countries which purchase sophisticated military equipment or whose military expenditures generally interfere materially with economic development. This whole question is intimately related to the political power of the military in Latin America. There seems little doubt that the civilian authorities in Peru, for example, are somewhat less than enthusiastic about the Mirage purchase but they did not have sufficient control of the military to prevent it.

But few governments in Latin America have yet learned how to control severe inflation, without stifling economic growth and depressing wages. This is perhaps the most severe dilemma of all. Of the countries visited on this trip, only Venezuela has enjoyed relative price stability—and Venezuela is unique because of the large income it enjoys from

petroleum and iron ore. In the others, inflation varied in 1967 from 20 percent in Peru to 27 percent in Argentina. Inflation of this magnitude is a fairly recent phenomenon in Peru, but in Brazil, Argentina, and Chile, even rates of 25, 27, and 22 percent respectively, represent triumphs of stabilization programs. It is perhaps significant that in Brazil and Argentina, where authoritarian governments are in power, these triumphs have been achieved principally at the cost of depressing wages which were at a bare subsistence level to begin with. Automobile workers in São Paulo, for example—the elite of the Brazilian labor force—earn an average of \$150 a month, while a Ford car costs \$7,500.

It is apparent that it is easier to avoid inflation than to stop it once it has started. But the fact is that it has started—indeed, it has been chronic—in many countries of Latin America, and more imaginative study needs to be given to humane, socially, and politically acceptable ways of stopping it.

Everywhere on this trip, there was concern over the effect of measures to correct the imbalance in U.S. international payments. This concern takes several forms, but they are all related to the fact that many Latin American countries also have critical balance-of-payments problems and the process of correcting the U.S. problem may aggravate the Latin American problem.

Despite the political liabilities of private U.S. investment mentioned above, it does play a crucial role in Latin American economic development. More immediately, it is an important factor in the Latin American capacity to service foreign debts and to finance essential imports, most of which come from the United States. Any substantial curtailment in the flow of private investment, or any substantial increase in the repatriation of profits, would have severely adverse effects.

The policy of tying U.S. assistance to procurement in the United States frequently serves to make such assistance more expensive—that is, Latin Americans get fewer goods per million dollars borrowed. Although Latin Americans would like to be able to use AID loans on the basis of worldwide bidding, they understand the unwillingness of the United States to see such funds spent in Europe or Japan. As an alternative to the present policy, they would like the opportunity to use at least a portion of AID loans for procurement within Latin America. This would make it possible for a portion of a loan to, say, Chile to be used for the procurement of machinery in, say, Brazil. The advantage of such an arrangement from the Latin American point of view would be that it would stimulate development in both Chile and Brazil and would contribute to the process of economic integration. This is a suggestion which is worthy of consideration, especially if techniques can be worked out to insure that AID funds spent in third countries find their way back to the United States and not into European banks.

More and more U.S. aid programs for Latin America tend to be balance of payment, or budgetary, aid that operates as a subsidy for U.S. exports.

At the same time, vigorous action is obviously necessary to protect the dollar. Latin Americans should recognize that a devaluation of the dollar would have an even more adverse impact on Latin America than is likely to be produced by any of the measures currently being taken to protect the dollar. Still, it would be a pity if we create problems for others in the process of solving our own. Yet, the irony of it is that in trying to help solve so many problems for other people, we have created a major problem for ourselves. To borrow a phrase from the past, there must be a way to avoid a second crucifixion of mankind on a cross of gold.

The industrial growth of Latin America has come about mainly through the development of industries which produce goods to substitute for imports. These have been the easiest industries to establish because they could be assured of a market through either tariffs or other restrictions on competing imports. To the extent to which they reduce imports, they also ease the country's balance-of-payments position. Experience indicates that this latter advantage may be more theoretical than real, because industrial development frequently increases rather than reduces the demand for imports.

In any event, almost everywhere on the trip, industrial development appeared to have gone about as far as it could go on the basis of import substitution and that further growth was dependent on the development of export markets. These markets may be found either in other Latin American countries or in the industrialized countries of Europe, North America, or Japan. The less developed countries of Asia and Africa presently offer scant prospects. Export markets in other Latin American countries can best be developed through Latin American economic integration. Export markets in the industrialized countries can be facilitated, of course, by a system of trade preferences on manufactured and semi-manufactured goods. This appears uppermost in the thoughts or plans of Latin American officials. It may become necessary for the U.S. Government to discourage this.

Latin American officials uniformly endorse economic integration—some with considerably more enthusiasm than others—but the process is moving slowly. In part, this is because intra-Latin American trade is a low percentage of Latin America's total foreign trade. The countries of Latin America have traditionally traded more with Europe and the United States than with each other. Geography means that intra-Latin American transportation is costly and difficult.

But Latin American economic integration is a slow process also because of the resistance of the Latin American business community. Because Latin American industrial development occurred on the basis of substituting for imports behind high protective walls, many Latin American businessmen are either unable or unwilling to compete with their neighbors.

Some progress has been made in the development of complementarity agreements whereby, for example, Brazil con-

centrates on the production of certain types of business machines and Argentina concentrates on the production of other types, with free trade between the two.

On the western side of the continent, Chile, and Peru have joined with Ecuador, Colombia, and Venezuela in a regional Andean integration scheme which is based on the theory that the process of integration will move more smoothly in a smaller unit than in a larger one.

So far as developing industrial export markets in North America and Europe is concerned, Latin Americans generally advocate a system of trade preferences. Such a system could take many forms, but all of them would have the common element that exports of manufactured or semimanufactured goods from Latin America would enter industrialized countries at a preference over similar goods from other industrialized countries. Shoes from Argentina, for example, would come into the United States at a lower tariff than shoes from Italy.

Such an arrangement, of course, is directly contrary to the well-established U.S. trade policy of most favored nation treatment. Yet several African countries enjoy a roughly analogous arrangement in Europe, and both Europe and the United States are under increasing pressure from less developed countries generally to establish such a system on a worldwide basis.

It seems unwise to abandon the most-favored-nation policy. Such an abandonment has within it the seeds of the development of rival world trading blocs with all their disadvantages. Preferential treatment for Latin American exports also carries with it the danger of further slowing the process of Latin American integration through continuing a form of protection for high-cost Latin American producers and reducing their incentives to become more efficient.

On the other hand, one must recognize the seriousness of the problems created for Latin America by its terms of trade and the necessity to expand its exports of industrial products. These problems are sufficiently serious that they warrant further study by the executive branch and the Congress.

One of the most striking aspects of Latin America is the growth of its cities. Caracas has grown from 500,000 in 1950 to 1,700,000 today. Greater Buenos Aires has a population of 7,000,000—one third the total of Argentina. Sao Paulo has more than 5,000,000—up 67 percent since 1960. Rio de Janeiro has more than 4 million; Santiago and Lima, 2,000,000 or more each. The new cities of Latin America are also growing. Construction of Brasilia was only completed in 1960, and today the city has 350,000 people. Ciudad Guayana, the heart of a new industrial complex in Venezuela, had 4,000 in 1950; today it has more than 100,000 and it is expected to have 250,000 by 1975.

This is in part a consequence of high rates of population growth generally on which there has been superimposed a significant migration from rural to urban areas. The need for jobs for this rapidly expanding labor force is immense—1 million a year in Brazil alone simply to keep unemployment from get-

ting worse. The needs for development of urban housing, health services, educational facilities are equally immense.

This implies a policy of rapid industrialization. But at the same time, the needs of the rural areas are no less acute—and those areas are perhaps even more explosive. So far, at any rate, there has been more rural than urban insurgency, and at least one highly placed Venezuelan says land reform is the fundamental cause of the failure of Castroite insurgency in his country.

Further, food production in Latin America as a whole is not keeping pace with population growth. Disruption of long-established agricultural systems through land reform could conceivably lead to short-term decreases in production. Yet land reform appears socially and politically necessary.

On all sides one sees and feels the dilemma in which Latin American, as well as United States, economic planners find themselves in attempting to apportion scarce resources. It is difficult to make a generalized judgment on this problem, but in considering it one should not lose sight of the fact that our times are characterized by a rising tide of human demand and hope, the rapidity and urgency of change, a phenomenally enlarging capacity to produce, to distribute, to communicate, to enlighten. In all of this, the United States must be a good neighbor.

WATERSHEDS: MANMADE WONDERS

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, one of my young constituents—Warren Lee Petryk, of Boyceville, Wis.—was recently awarded the prize of first runner-up in the statewide Wisconsin soil and water conservation speaking contest. The speech which brought this honor to Warren is entitled "Watersheds: Manmade Wonders" in which the author displays not only a firm grasp of the importance of well-managed watersheds but a unique appreciation of the need to conserve our natural resources. I want to bring this fine speech to the attention of my colleagues and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WATERSHEDS: MANMADE WONDERS

What is a watershed? Many people would tell you, "It is a place farmers plant trees and save our water for us to drink." Oh, but it is so much more than that! It is an ability that God gave man to save our beautiful and wonderful natural resources, including the life-giving substance—Water. Watershed is a new term to many people.

Here are the signs of a good, well-managed watershed: (1) The plant cover is thick and heavy. (2) Streams and lakes are clear. (3) The soil is spongy underfoot. (4) The streams run even during the dry season. (5) The banks of the streams are stable and very little sediment is carried off them. (6) Fish are found in cool, clear ponds. (7) On the slopes is nutritious plant cover for the wildlife. (8) It is well-protected from fire.

How can this be brought about? There must be planned use of the soil and plant cover if the water flow is to be sustained. On the croplands, we must use good farming methods such as strip-cropping, terracing,

and we must plant grassed waterways where gullies had been to prevent erosion and waste of precious water. On non-farmed lands, which are very important to the watershed, the various uses of the land, such as grazing cattle, timber-cutting, and hunting and fishing must be carried on so as they do not speed up water runoff, encourage erosion, or cause water pollution. These are the things we can do and we must do if soil and water conservation is to be upheld in our watersheds.

All of this is a watershed, but put quite simply, a watershed, or drainage basin, is an area of land from which a stream gets its supply of water.

In a well-managed watershed, when it rains, the soil works as a "blotter." It soaks up the rainwater and uses it for plant use. The excess runs slowly through the plants to drain into the stream. The water runs slowly, thus preventing rapid rising of the stream which causes floods. This also prevents sediment from being carried off the stream banks and blocking our pure water reservoir. When this happens we must ration our community's water. So, a well-managed watershed also determines how much pure, clean, sparkling water we get.

Sediment—or good healthy soil carried off by water—is one of our major reasons to have a watershed. Sediment has blocked up hundreds of reservoirs all over the country. To stop this carrying away of soil, we must use terracing, strip-cropping, and contour farming. And to make our stream banks stable, we plant and maintain trees, shrubs, and grass.

When sediment blocks reservoirs, it costs much money to filter and purify the muddy water. Building up of sediment chokes our streams causing floods. When this happens, the streams back up, costing us millions of dollars each year to clean up. Sediment is one reason why our streams and lakes do not have the fish population they used to. In some places, sediment was so bad that it actually choked fish to death! And costs to dredge sediment from clogged reservoirs is from 25 to 50 cents per cubic yard!

In closing, may I quote from a United States Department of Agriculture bulletin: "It is up to all—each one of us—to give careful thought and constructive support to good watershed management. After all, what happens to our watersheds can well determine whether our communities, and Our Nation, prosper and progress or go downhill with wasted waters to poverty and oblivion."

A NEW POLICY FOR INDIANS?

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, I wish to comment on President Johnson's message to the Congress concerning Indian programs as proposed by the administration.

I commend the President for giving his attention to the much-overlooked problems facing the American Indian and I note that the President's message was coincidentally submitted one day after the Senate Interior Committee, of which I am a member, began extensive hearings on Indian policy.

These hearings focused on Senate Concurrent Resolution 11, submitted by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN]. I have asked Senator McGOVERN for the privilege of cosponsoring the resolution, which establishes a national policy for the American Indian and Alaskan natives.

In so doing, I salute his leadership in this area and give recognition to the excellent provisions which are found in this policy resolution.

Among these provisions is the explicit recognition that Indian governing bodies

should be recognized as having the full authority "to determine the extent and manner of utilization of available resources for their communities."

Further, the policy resolution replaces the ill-considered termination policy which was passed many years ago by the Congress, but which caused great resentment and insecurity among Indian peoples. The old termination policy "poisoned the well" for effective dialog between Indian groups and the U.S. Congress.

Attention today to a new, enlightened policy which does not shirk from a full responsibility on the part of the U.S. Congress for Indian programs is a step in the right direction.

This new policy dispenses with notions of paternalism and emphasizes the need for self-help, and self-participation, coupled with full cooperation between Congress and Federal agencies.

During the course of the investigation by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, several days ago, eloquent testimony was presented by both Indian citizens and whites indicating that the paternalistic basis for Federal welfare programs was no longer meeting the needs of the American Indian on other disadvantaged groups.

Paternalism was soundly denounced as a bankrupt policy. New techniques with special emphasis on jobs and education are now being examined by the Congress in order to break the growing vicious circle which comes from dependence on the dole.

In a separate investigation conducted by my office recently, evidence was uncovered of bureaucratic disease. Duplication of effort and a lack of coordination between a multiplicity of Federal programs is extensive. Up until the time of a conference which I sponsored in my office, many Federal officials from a variety of agencies, responsible for programs on the Wind River Indian Reservation of Wyoming, had never been aware of each other's existence in Washington, much less the goals and resources they had in common.

This conference uncovered instances of Federal money which was going begging for takers while urgent needs remained unfulfilled on the reservation.

For instance, Federal housing money had been appropriated, but the programs specified by the Department of Housing and Urban Development were ill suited for the specific needs of the Wind River Indian Reservation.

Coordination between HUD and the Bureau of Indian Affairs with the assistance of the Office of Economic Opportunity could and should have identified and solved this problem.

Unfortunately, the President's message on the American Indian reflects this all too familiar pattern. The President cites a continued emphasis on a number of existing Great Society programs. At the same time, however, the Congress has been presented with a possible cutback of Federal funds to schools in federally affected or impacted areas, such as the Wind River Indian Reservation. This proposed appropriation cutback has a much more dramatic effect for the Indian of the reservation than does any amount of escalating rhetoric in Wash-

ington about the severity of the long-neglected Indian problems.

Fortunately, the Senate Appropriations Committee, after urgings from myself and other Senators, has restored funds for Public Law 874, which are necessary in order for schools on Wyoming's reservation to remain open during the last 2 months of each school year.

Without the President's support for this specific need, however, there remains an unfortunate possibility that the House of Representatives will eliminate these funds when the appropriations bill goes to conference committee.

The Indian people of our State and the Nation will get little solace from high-blown messages sent down from Washington. What is needed, is a sustained and dedicated effort to get at the root of the many problems facing Indian peoples.

This effort must proceed on a continuing basis and must be sensitive to individual and local needs. Multiplication of Federal programs at the top will only serve to make the bureaucracy even more topheavy and inefficient.

But I am hopeful that out of all the rhetoric of recent days will come some lasting rededication on the part of responsible people.

Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to a poem which was printed in a recent newsletter published by St. Michael's Center in Ethete, Wyo., which is on the Wind River Indian Reservation.

This poem, more than any polished pronouncements from Washington, issues a call of urgency and responsibility to every American citizen. It says:

Crowded city people—we know
you need our mountains
clean air
and miles between each other . . .
If only we could share.

Our miles bring loneliness;
No jobs are in the mountains,
And you can't sell clean air.
If only we could share.

Who needs our common sores?
Dirt and cold and
Not-knowing-how?
Drinks and drugs to forget—
We share.
Oh, Lord, how we share!

VACATION TOUR OF WYOMING BY LIGHT PLANE

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, the wonders of Wyoming are due for a new style of vacationing enjoyment this coming June, when private pilots undertake a flying tour of the State sponsored jointly by the State Aeronautics and Travel Commissions and the Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association. The AOPA Pilot has detailed this unique travel adventure in an article in its March issue. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WYOMING ORGANIZES VACATION AIR TOUR

A vacation tour of Wyoming by light-plane, that is beginning to arouse the interest of travel enthusiasts throughout the country, has been scheduled for June 23-29. During the week-long adventure, partici-

pants will be treated to some of the most unusual and spectacular scenery in the United States yet they will be freed from the responsibilities of planning a complete vacation. The tour will begin at Casper where, at a reception and banquet, a welcome will be given by Gov. Stan Hathaway.

FAA and Wyoming Aeronautics Commission personnel will guide, instruct and accompany the tour; the Weather Bureau will brief touring pilots. The itinerary that has been published by cosponsors, the Wyoming Aeronautics and Travel Commissions and AOPA, is highlighted by visits to some of our most outstanding national attractions, for example:

Devils Tower, established by President Theodore Roosevelt as the first U.S. National Monument in 1906. Formed 50 million years ago by eruption of molten rock, the fluted tower rises 1,280 feet above the Belle Fourche River in northeastern Wyoming.

Yellowstone National Park, designated by President Ulysses S. Grant in 1872 as this nation's first National Park. Within these boundaries are found Old Faithful; Grand Canyon of the Yellowstone River, 24 miles of sheer rock walls; and Yellowstone Lake.

Grand Teton National Park, located in the northwestern part of the state, just south of Yellowstone National Park. The park is domi-

nated by the Teton Range; largest peak in the range is Grand Teton, which rises to 13,766 feet.

Tour reservations for 100 airplanes (accommodating approximately 300 people) will be accepted on a first-come first-served basis. Airplanes must be capable of operating at 10,500 feet altitude (no oxygen required), and pilots should bring their own tie-down equipment. (A special communication/intercom frequency has been designated for pilots' use.) All-inclusive costs (transportation from airports to motels, lodging, meals and entertainment, gratuities, etc.) are as follows: single, \$173; double with two beds in room, \$280; triple in separate beds, \$388. Reservations should be sent to Wyoming Air Tour, 2320 Capitol Avenue, Cheyenne, Wyo. 82001. (Pilots must arrange to fly their own or rental aircraft.)

Wyoming is a state of high plains, mountains, and occasional badlands. The climate is cool and dry, with local variation because of altitude. At high elevations, freezing temperatures may be encountered any month. Annual average rainfall is low. A variety of wildlife is to be found throughout the state: mule and white-tailed deer, elk, black and grizzly bear, mountain sheep, antelope, mountain lion, moose, grouse, rabbit, and wild turkey. Natural lakes and streams have trout, bass and walleye.

Participants in the Flying Vacation Tour of Wyoming will have an opportunity to take a backward look at history. Sights of cowboys, rodeos, Indians in colorful dress, dude ranch life, rugged countryside should conjure up images of the Old West.

The Wyoming air tour has been designed to introduce participants to the culture and development and main vacation areas of the state. Actual flying time should be about eight hours.

REPORT OF JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE ON USE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND U.S. DOLLARS IN 1967

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, in accordance with the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the report of the Joint Economic Committee, concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized by that committee in 1967 in connection with foreign travel.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS BY THE JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE, U.S. SENATE, BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1967

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
W. E. Brock 3d:											
Brazil	Cruzeiro	604.26	223.80	94.50	35.00	27.00	10.00			725.76	268.80
Puerto Rico	Dollar		24.15		5.00				3.00		32.15
Subtotal			247.95		40.00				3.00		300.95
Jacob K. Javits: Brazil	Cruzeiro	229.50	85.00	170.10	63.00	94.50	35.00	124.20	46.00	618.30	229.00
William S. Moorhead: Brazil	do.	633.00	234.44	301.00	111.48					934.00	345.92
Henry S. Reuss:											
Brazil	Cruzeiro	410.00	151.85	175.00	64.81			6.55	2.42	591.55	219.08
Netherlands	Guilder			128.15	35.70					128.15	35.70
United Kingdom	Pound	7-10-0	18.00	14-0-0	33.60			5-10-7	13.20	27-0-0	64.80
Subtotal			169.85		134.11				15.62		319.58
Daniel Szabo:											
Belgium	Belgian franc	5,268	106.00	8,830	178.00	547	11.00	250	5.00	14,895	300.00
France	Franc	200.50	40.92	170.00	34.69	51.00	10.40	43.50	8.87	465.00	94.88
Germany	Deutsche mark					2,071.80	521.47			2,071.80	521.47
United Kingdom	Pound	6-1-0	16.94	3-9-3	9.66	3-5-3	9.15	1-0-5	2.85	13-15-11	38.60
Subtotal			163.86		222.35		552.02		16.72		954.95
Aurelio Peccei, Italy	Lira		150.00			582,300	931.68			591,675	1,081.68
Kenneth Younger: United Kingdom	Pound		150.00			268-16-0	751.47			322-11-3	901.47
Total			1,201.10		570.94		2,280.17		81.34		4,133.55

¹ Cost of official dinner given by Senator Javits on November 23.

² Round trip transportation purchased by State Department.

³ Testified at hearings before the Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy.

⁴ \$150 advanced by U.S. embassies before departure for the United States (3 days per diem, at \$50 per day)—no breakdown furnished the Joint Economic Committee. For accounting purposes entire amount included under lodging.

RECAPITULATION

Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)

Amount
4,133.5

WILLIAM PROXMIER,
Chairman, Joint Economic Committee.

RETURNED PEACE CORPS VOLUNTEERS

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, it is estimated that by 1980 there will be 200,000 returned Peace Corps volunteers at home in America. Right now there are 15,000 returned Peace Corps volunteers in the country. Their exploits abroad, which have brought great credit to our Nation and to themselves, are well known. Mr. President, there is evidence the returned volunteers are coming home aware of many problems, keenly motivated to work for solutions. Mademoiselle magazine recently published an article on the

returnees by Judith Harkison which tells the story very well.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MIDDLE-CLASS: REVOLUTIONARIES ARE HOME—PEACE CORPS RETURNES ARE PUTTING INTO PRACTICE HERE WHAT THEY LEARNED OVERSEAS

(By Judith Harkison)

"Since I've been back, my friends don't understand me and I don't understand them," claims a social-service worker in Austin. "What they really care about is buy-

ing draperies and living-room furniture. I'm interested in what's happening in the world."

In New York, a career girl discovers "a nine-to-five job is so much less demanding, you almost feel guilty. It leaves a vacuum in your mind."

A Washington, D.C., bachelor confesses: "You're pretty well ready to tell your family that you're not going back to what you were brought up to be—you're going to do what you really want."

Speaking out are three of the 15,000 Returned Peace Corps Volunteers (RPCVs), back from their two-year work projects in East Africa, Latin America, or the Middle East. Having learned overseas that one person can effect change and having seen the results of it, they have acquired confidence

in themselves and are looking for action. Usually they turn sharp, discerning eyes on America asking: "Where and how do we fit in?"

Because service in the Peace Corps tends to focus on career interests that often require further studies, one out of three volunteers continues his/her education afterward. A third of these pursue social and area studies, a fifth go into education, and 14 percent seek technical training. In 1967-68, 75 colleges and universities (including Harvard, Columbia, M.I.T.) will have offered 350 scholarships, assistantships, or fellowships exclusively to ex-volunteers. Several schools give anywhere from four to nine graduate credits for Peace Corps service (among these are Michigan, Syracuse, Georgetown, Cornell). The Ford Foundation created a program of Study Fellowships for International Development for RPCVs.

Others head for poverty pockets in city ghettos and underdeveloped rural areas; few return to their home towns. They settle primarily in teaching, social service, public health, government, and War on Poverty projects.

Most volunteers come from professional and middle-income families (80 percent have baccalaureate degrees, the majority in liberal arts), and they are indifferent, at this point, to the affluent life of their parents. They grew up with it and are bored with its trifling concerns. They don't want to settle down; they want more experience and travel. Said one early returnee: "The Peace Corps volunteer is a middle-class revolutionary. He's not the kind of guy to go out and burn Newark down, but he wants to change things."

Is the return to America anticlimactic after the unique and challenging experience RPCVs have had in the slum, jungle, or bush of an underdeveloped nation? Are they having difficulty finding similar satisfaction at home?

For most of them, the answer is a definite "No," although a few did feel some reverse culture shock at first. But the celebrated "re-entry crisis," during which time the returnee allegedly has trouble communicating, getting a job, and finding himself, has been exaggerated. "People who experienced the most shock had problems before they joined the Peace Corps," said a returnee. And a quiet, personable Peace Corps couple from Oregon agrees: "We didn't look at the United States with different-colored glasses when we returned, because we didn't have on different-colored glasses when we left."

Other than the discovery of Teflon frying pans, color TV, New York City's talking trash cans, or air-conditioned buses, the impact was caused generally by the shift from a foreign culture of individuality, leisure pace, and hospitality into the American tumult of schedules, conformity, noise, tension, and impatience. In addition, most volunteers were dismayed by their friends' preoccupation with security and materialism, and their lack of interest in social problems.

"I just couldn't get over how provincial, how narrow, how utterly uninformed and uninterested most people I met were about world affairs, or even national affairs," one said in bewilderment.

Most RPCVs are finding jobs (albeit with effort) that are not only stimulating and responsible, but are in many cases directly parallel to their overseas experience. For example, Washington lawyer Bruce Patner, who laid the groundwork in Peru for banks to begin financing low-cost housing developments, was sent to Los Angeles after the Watts riots by the Office of Economic Opportunity, to do exactly the same thing: he rooted out the leadership, identified the complications, and helped to set in motion the financial mechanism for rebuilding the area.

Soon after his return to Portland, Oregon, Phil Peters received a telephone call: "We're

setting up a local migrant league. Weren't you a Peace Corps volunteer?" For two years, Phil assisted the 30,000 Mexican migrant workers who arrive in the Willamette Valley each summer; since August, he has been developing training programs for a community-action center. Both jobs are extensions of the PC work he did in a Guatemalan village.

On Chicago's festering Division Street, Patricia McMahon works among the Puerto Rican poor, helping them to help themselves. She did much the same thing in Honduras, "but it is more difficult here," she believes, "because too many promises have already gone unfulfilled."

Although as an Irish Catholic she had automatically opposed birth control, her Honduran experience convinced her that it is an essential element in the welfare of the poor. On Division Street, she is encouraging family planning among the Puerto Ricans, in whose culture masculinity is measured by the number of offspring produced. Patricia has also learned to accept all invitations of hospitality, as a gesture of confidence, even if it means the host may be going without his next meal and Patricia may be drowning in 12 cups of coffee and 12 tacos each day.

When Tom Oliver returned from Nigeria, he knew he wanted to make a contribution to society's betterment. There were, in his view, two ways of going about it: either picket the power structure from the sidewalk or join the Establishment and try to improve the system from within. He joined Volunteers in Service to America (VISTA)—and thus the Federal Government—as assistant to the director of special projects in Washington. His job is to expand the role of the VISTA volunteer—who is doing the same thing in Harlem that other young Americans are doing in the Rio slums.

VISTA has been called "the stepchild of the Peace Corps," for it was the Peace Corps that focused national attention on poverty-ridden regions and served as a model for its domestic counterpart. "Between the two," Tom says, "the tougher game is in VISTA" because "you don't have the glamor of working overseas in a foreign language and culture. Here you have different cultures, but it's much less exotic. The problems in this country are more real in that they affect you closer to the stomach. It's your country, your city, and your block, whereas, over there, it's their country and their problem. You'll do what you can while you're there but eventually you leave, whereas you never leave VISTA territory; there's always New York."

Tom studied political science at Bowdoin College, graduating in 1964. He and the former Sue Kintner (Middleburg, '64) were married that summer, then went into Peace Corps training and departed subsequently for Nigeria, where they taught in a secondary school.

Like her husband, Sue Oliver draws on her Peace Corps experiences in her job with Trans-Century Corporation—a privately owned company that plans and manages projects aimed at improving social and economic life in the United States and abroad. Its headquarters are in an aging storefront office in the heart of Washington's slums. Sue, along with several other returned volunteers, is working to establish remedial education for D.C. highschool dropouts, basic instruction and counseling for the unemployed, an educational clinic in the Bahamas, and a credit system for the poor.

Trans-Century's director of recruitment is another RPCV—lanky, spectacled Dick Irish, who previously worked at Peace Corps headquarters recruiting staffers. "I interviewed 600 returned volunteers. Three brought up salary, none mentioned benefits. They ask, 'How much independence will I have? Is the responsibility significant? Is the work important?'"

It is not surprising that returnees hope to find jobs that offer authority and a chance to manage something on their own. Overseas,

in the absence of close supervision, very often alone, the volunteers relied essentially upon their own resources. Many held responsible positions: teachers often doubled as school administrators; community workers became assistants to the village mayor. "In Liberia, we were somebodies," says Lorraine Bouffard, of Hartford. "In a few villages we visited, we were the first white people they had ever seen. At home, you're just another American. You look around and say to yourself, 'Where's the band?'"

RPCVs don't mind anonymity so long as there is room for flexibility and personal initiative. "We don't feel the need for fancy job titles," said one. Sue Oliver thinks of it as having a job where your role is not defined: "If it looks exciting, you try it. . . . If it smells good, you just follow your nose." And another says, "I can't stand being restrained by bureaucracy of any kind; I think it stifles creativity."

The Peace Corps has established a Career Information Service to help returned volunteers find jobs, get scholarships, or take tests for graduate school or Federal employment while they're still overseas. The career staff provides counseling, publishes a monthly list of job opportunities, maintains career libraries abroad, and handles special requests for information.

Finding the right job is not easy. When Ann Arnsen, 24, returned from San Salvador to Washington, D.C., she signed up with employment agencies, applied to Government agencies, and answered newspaper ads. Her search was long and strenuous chiefly because she was determined to work directly with the problems of underdeveloped countries. (She now raises funds for the hospital ship *Hope*.)

Ann and her RPCV roommate, Eloise McClintic, share a century-old house in the picturesque Capitol Hill section of Washington. Eloise, 26, was a premed major at the University of California at Berkeley. Not sure that she wanted to go to medical school after graduation, she entered the Peace Corps instead. When she returned from the Dominican Republic, still uncertain about her ambitions, Eloise became a stewardess for Pan American Airways ("I wanted to travel, keep up my Spanish, and make contacts").

Tired of her job ten months later, she quit and went to Washington. There she worked for two years with the Council on Leaders and Specialists (a contract agency for the State Department that plans programs for visiting dignitaries). She left the Council last August, torn between medicine and taking a doctorate in Latin American studies. Now, she's teaching school during the day and taking review courses in science at the University of Maryland in the evening ("in case I decide to take the medical-school entrance exam"). "Had I not gone overseas," Eloise says, "I probably would have been content to settle down and practice in Illinois. But the more you know of other people and other places, the more you want to know."

About half the returnees make a significant change in their career goals. Before going to Tanzania, vivacious Barbara Boyle, 26, graduated from Stanford with a B.A. degree in international relations. She had always planned a career in the Foreign Service, took the exam in Tanzania and passed it. One week before leaving for her first assignment, she was offered a job helping "to plan a college" with Harris Wofford, then associate director of the Peace Corps, who was about to establish, and become president of, a new experimental branch of the State University of New York in Old Westbury, Long Island, patterned after Peace Corps education programs.

Barbara took the job. It meant a complete departure from her career plans, but she explained it this way: "I felt that American representatives overseas—military officers, diplomats, businessmen—were not well-informed and that their philosophical ideas

were often very wrong. The blame for this, I think, rests in our educational system. If we want to achieve any degree of peace, we have to equip our leaders with stronger mental resources.

"I suddenly realized I had been working in the wrong direction. If I'm to do anything of what I want, I have to start way behind the outer level which is the Foreign Service. I have to go back to the very beginning, which I feel is education."

Barbara is presently on the planning staff of the college, scheduled to open in September 1970. She hopes it will become a model for higher education. "The theory is to get students to learn how to learn, to become their own teachers," says Barbara, "instead of being the passive students most of us were in college." The college may send freshmen to live for several months in a ghetto, an Appalachian community, or on an Indian reservation, and thereby come to grips with alien cultures. Barbara believes that the confidence they develop in their ability to cope will enter into their approach to education.

President Johnson has tried, as did President Kennedy, to attract RPCVs into Federal service, and currently about 23 per cent of employed returnees work in the Government. Their overseas experiences have led them to the Agency for International Development (A.I.D.), for example, where more than 200 are employed around the world in agriculture, health, public safety, and finance.

To date, 84 RPCVs have been appointed to the Foreign Service, although most of them only recently. "The first returnees just couldn't pass the exam," said a Government training officer. "When you come back from a *flavela* in Brazil, the state of your mental equipment is often pretty low. Most returnees just don't have the facts on American history—and they're not up on current events here or elsewhere."

Early RPCVs and American businessmen viewed one another with skepticism, and even now only 11 per cent of the ex-volunteers are employed in this area. A lot of company people thought returnees were undisciplined and, sometimes, outright mavericks. They were too creative and restless for typing or selling insurance.

An RPCV who fled New York and the business world is Penny White, who, after graduation from Wells College (with a French major), spent two years in Lord & Taylor's executive training program in New York, and a third year as secretary to the personnel director at Memorial Hospital, before joining the Peace Corps. A tall, bright-eyed Washingtonian, Penny now lives in an attractive Georgetown apartment and works on the Peace Corps staff as liaison officer for volunteers stationed in North Africa and the Near East.

When she came back from Tunisia in 1966, she began looking for a personnel job among Manhattan oil companies, banks, nonprofit groups. She wanted something in an international division, where she could use her French and work with foreigners. Although she abhors the idea of routine chores, she was offered only secretarial jobs. Moreover, she discovered that only top management had close contacts with foreigners.

Perhaps because she did not find a satisfactory job there, Penny changed her mind about living in New York: "The dirt, the madness, the pace, the rushing—New York is the epitome of it." Penny will remain in Washington for perhaps two years, thinks she will then live abroad and make a career in public relations or tourism in North Africa. "In the emerging countries, young people have the chance to do meaningful things in social and economic development," she explains. "Here you're a tiny frog in a huge puddle. You can hardly do anything significant. Over there you're not knocking your head against a wall."

Some business and industrial firms with international interests made early overtures to ex-volunteers. One of these, the United

Fruit Company, stated: "We feel that PCVs who have served a tour of duty in Latin America and have gained a knowledge of Spanish are ideally suited for the company's operations in Central America." But Mary-Rita Tascketta, director of the Career Information Service, feels the problem is that "business has had trouble communicating with the volunteer, because the volunteer is not receptive to the commercial world. RPCVs hesitate to join a company where they think they will be stifled by a rigid and conservative system. It isn't because they're not money conscious; they are—just as much as anybody else."

"On the other hand," she continues, "businessmen don't know how to appeal to the volunteer in their help-wanted ads [in the CIS bulletin]. They themselves don't know what there is in the Peace Corps experience that might make returnees specifically valuable to business."

Kaiser Aluminum and Chemical Corporation in Oakland was interested in finding this out after they had accidentally hired a returnee who rapidly and successfully caught on to the company's system. What, they asked Miss Tascketta, has the RPCV got that the average 25-year-old business or accounting graduate does not have?

From a two-hour conference came these exclusions: he has proved to some extent that he is more emotionally mature; he's adaptable, flexible, patient, and able to tolerate certain frustrations. He is a little more friendly and outgoing with a genuine liking for other people. He's been motivated by the desire to be of service to others and, at the same time, to learn from others.

About 16 companies now encourage employees to take a two-year leave for the Peace Corps without losing seniority. Among these are Kaiser, AT&T, General Electric, IBM, and Kimberly-Clark. Labor unions are beginning to do the same for skilled labor (the United Auto Workers, for instance).

International banking, too, is a logical employer. Kenneth Cole, for example joined the Peace Corps after law school and was sent to Ecuador in 1963 equipped with a B.S. in accounting and a law degree from Berkeley. In Guayaquil he worked on an A.I.D.-sponsored plan to develop credit unions. When he returned home, he found to his surprise that several prospective employers were interested in his experiences—he had considered the Peace Corps "only one more line on the resume which might open one more door for an interview."

Kenneth works for the Inter-American Development Bank in Washington, a profit-making organization funded by Western Hemisphere countries to finance economic and social development in Latin America. He is using his Peace Corps experience "100 per cent down the line," and feels that it saved him from the dull but secure job he had considered taking in a law firm.

Early returners seeking teaching positions found, to their disappointment, a hide-bound attitude toward their lack of certification in spite of their overseas teaching experiences. When Barbara Gladysiewicz returned in 1963, having taught English for two years in the Philippines, she sought a job in a New York slum school. The Board of Education insisted that she needed an extra two credits in science and one in math for permanent certification. Disgusted with the red tape, she left Manhattan and was hired in Spring Valley, New York.

Frequently, school administrators were not only parochial but prejudiced as well. Before Linda and Gary Berghold returned to the U.S., Linda applied for a teaching position in Boston, mailing her application from Addis Ababa. When her letter was not answered, she complained bitterly to the Massachusetts Department of Education. Eventually she got an answer: her envelope was returned with the following scrawled across the top: "We do not hire teachers of

foreign extraction." They had not even read past the postmark.

Progressive states, however, are beginning to see the light. California will grant a standard certificate to Peace Corps teachers who hold a bachelor's degree and meet course requirements in the subject they will teach. The California State Legislature, in a parallel action, passed a bill creating a new certification category for them. In Philadelphia, immediate provisional appointment at the salary of a third-year teacher is given to all RPCVs.

New York State is now going all out to lure volunteers. Not only are they waiving requirements ("It is usually possible to facilitate the placing of those volunteers with a bachelor's degree and two years of Peace Corps teaching experience"), but they have hired a special liaison officer in Albany specifically for the Peace Corps, and have also sponsored and paid for three job conferences, enabling administrators and job-seeking volunteers to meet. The largest, held last April in Manhattan, was attended by 421 volunteers (almost half were hired) with 150 schools represented. A smaller one on the Syracuse campus was attended by 72 RPCVs: half were hired, at an average salary of \$6,800.

Many of the returnees request a slum school, and some believe it is even more difficult teaching here than overseas because of the negative attitude of many American pupils. Peace Corps service in Liberia gave Lorraine Bouffard not only the incentive but the mental flexibility necessary to teach underprivileged Negro children in Hartford's North End. It also gave her something to offer them: a knowledge and respect for the history of West Africa.

Nowadays, the Peace Corps is attracting more married couples than before; one out of every five is married, compared to one out of ten who served five years ago. Altogether, 6,665 married volunteers have participated, and nearly 800 weddings have taken place overseas. As a matchmaker, the Corps may well outline the computer!

Are Peace Corps marriages subject to unusual strains and pressures? Yes and no. The Bergholds, who were married before they entered the Peace Corps, fervently agree that marriages are usually strengthened by the mutual experiences of a common vocation. Since PCV couples are separated from their families, they must work out their own problems, for "a wife can't run home to Mother," says Linda.

Dick and Sally Irish (she is currently secretary to Mrs. Robert F. Kennedy) were also married before they left for the Philippines, where both taught elementary school. There was some competition between them, Sally admits, and they were continually being compared. "You are together all the time," she says. "It's wonderful, but also very difficult. If you have marital problems, they'll be intensified." After sharing so much overseas, Sally decided to participate more in Dick's life at home, rather than get a full-time job herself. During the first year, while Dick worked on the Peace Corps staff, she did volunteer work in his department.

Marian and Peter Downs of San Francisco felt their Peace Corps experience was good for their marriage. "After two years in a Nepal village where we worked together every day and had to learn how to run a house together—cooking our meals over an open fire and carrying our daily water supply a quarter of a mile—we communicate much better with each other."

The Peace Corps is expanding rapidly; there are 15,000 volunteers currently overseas, and by 1980 there will be 200,000 returned volunteers. Beyond the stated goals of helping emerging peoples and promoting clearer understanding of America, the experience has served the volunteers inestimably in a personal way; it has helped them toward maturity, career focus and, more im-

portant, has enlarged and deepened their understanding of the world beyond their door-steps.

"After living in a country where people are just eking out an existence, the 'necessities' here are like luxuries," says the Downs couple. "We're not going to get into the rut of having to have 'things.' Right now the Joneses are so far ahead of us we could never catch up—and we don't care to."

And another RPCV sums it up: "Some people go into the Peace Corps to change the world. You don't change the world—you change yourself."

ALCOHOLISM AND DRUG ABUSE— REPORT OF PHILADELPHIA DISTRICT ATTORNEY ARLEN SPECTER

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I recently requested that the concluding chapter of Philadelphia District Attorney Arlen Specter's annual report be printed in the RECORD because it addresses itself to one of the major problems confronting this Nation—the need for law enforcement and the protection of individual rights. Another section of the report discusses the complex and challenging problems of alcoholism and drug abuse. Because I believe it essential that enlightened thinking in the law enforcement and criminal justice field be brought to the attention of all interested persons, I ask unanimous consent that this portion of the report be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the item was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S CITIZENS COMMITTEE ON ALCOHOLISM AND DRUG ADDICTION

By the early fall of 1967, it was decided that it would be helpful to form a Citizens Committee on Alcoholism and Drug Addiction. A number of factors had coalesced which required a re-appraisal of the problems of drug addiction and alcoholism. Among those factors were:

(1) Court decisions which increasingly viewed alcoholism and drug addiction as diseases, free from the traditional criminal prosecution.

(2) Evidence of a spread of drug addiction of certain types in all classes of society and particularly among college students.

(3) The need for a therapeutic resident facility for both drug addiction and alcoholism in Philadelphia.

(4) The recommendation of the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice that police be relieved of the duty of making arrests for habitual drunkenness which today constitutes such a heavy drain on police manpower.

It was concluded that a Citizens Committee could bring new ideas to these problems and could further stimulate community support for such projects which were deemed necessary.

The Committee consists of:

Dr. Millard Gladfelter, Chairman of the Committee; Chancellor, Temple University.
Mr. H. Robert Cathcart, Vice President, Pennsylvania Hospital.

Mr. Anthony Cortigene, Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America.

Mr. Paul J. Cupp, Chairman of the Board, Acme Markets, Inc.

Dr. Frederick B. Glaser, Assistant Professor of Psychiatry, Temple University.

Mrs. Mary M. Kaluha, Member, Board of Trustees, The Philadelphia State Hospital at Byberry.

Mr. Jean Paul Mather, President, University City Science Center.

Reverend Arnold D. Nearn, District Superintendent, African Methodist Episcopal Church.

Professor Henry S. Ruth, University of Pennsylvania Law School.

Mr. Charles G. Simpson, General Manager, Philadelphia Gas Works.

Honorable Lewis H. Van Dusen, Jr., Chancellor, Philadelphia Bar Association.

Mr. William H. Wilcox, Executive Director, Greater Philadelphia Movement.

Mr. Elias Wolf, Chairman of the Board, Metal Edge Industries.

Late in 1967, the Committee decided to visit the Daytop Village on Staten Island, New York with a view to planning a resident facility for drug addiction for Eastern Pennsylvania.

RESIDENT FACILITY FOR DRUG ADDICTION

Among the factors, which called for the creation of a Citizens Committee to work on the problem of drug addiction, was the absence of therapeutic resident facilities for drug addiction in the Philadelphia area. On September 14, 1967, the District Attorney's Office called to the attention of Governor Raymond P. Shafer the need for a Resident Treatment Center for victims of addictive diseases in Eastern Pennsylvania.

This Office suggested that the General State Authority of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania should build and equip a Resident Treatment Center as a research and demonstration project and that the State should lease it to a non-profit corporation. Existing state and federal purchase-of-care programs should finance operations. It was suggested that the Resident Treatment Center would be less expensive to operate than a prison and would produce a better rate of recovery than that generally attributable to penal institutions.

Governor Raymond P. Shafer replied on October 4, 1967 commenting that the proposal had "great merit." The Governor indicated his support for the allocation of capital funds on both economic and humanitarian grounds.

At the close of the year, efforts were in process to secure the requisite appropriation for construction of the Resident Treatment Center.

RECOGNITION OF ALCOHOLISM AS A DISEASE

The revolving door

Since 1794 persons intoxicated in public have been arrested in Pennsylvania under a law which provides for a fine of \$75, or if they cannot pay, 24 hours imprisonment in the House of Correction, 18 P.S. Sec. 1523. A 1921 statute raised the amount of the fine to \$5.00, 47 P.S. Sec. 722. Under another set of statutes, magistrates have been thought to be authorized to incarcerate "habitual drunkards" in the House of Correction for periods up to 90 days, 61 P.S. Sec. 751 and Sec. 671, et seq.

The number of arrests under these statutes is enormous. In 1966, out of a total of 90,000 arrests for all offenses committed in the City of Philadelphia, 41,000 were for public drunkenness. Behind this startling statistic is a huge community expenditure of police time, court time, and money to say nothing of an enormous waste of human resources.

In practice, the traditional system of handling public intoxicants has been a blot on the administration of justice. In a typical week, approximately 500 public intoxicants will be arrested in the 6th Police District alone. After arrest, these persons are kept in cells overnight to await their hearing before a magistrate in the morning. When morning arrives, they are paraded out in a group, before the magistrate, who then asks whether there are any complainants against them, or whether any of them want to go to the House of Correction for their own protection and health. Aside from those few who are sent to the House of Correction as punishment for whatever petty offense they may have committed while drunk and those who volunteer to go because of their debilitated condition, the large remainder of persons are

turned loose to go back to their skid row surroundings and inevitably another alcoholic binge, arrest and discharge.

This process aptly has been termed the "revolving door" through which the alcohol addicts and habitual drunks pass and return, time and time again. It is estimated that of the 41,000 arrests made in 1966, more than half reflect repetitive arrests of some 3,000 to 5,000 chronic alcohol addicts.

This office's position on alcoholism

In the landmark case of *Robinson v. California*, 370 U.S. 660 (1962), the United States Supreme Court held that narcotics addiction was a disease and not a crime. Therefore, while a person could be punished for the sale and possession of narcotics, he could not justly be punished for his status of being an addict.

The implications of the *Robinson* decision for the problem of alcoholism were obvious. If narcotics addiction is a disease, certainly alcohol addiction is not less so. Moreover, if alcohol addicts may not be punished as criminals merely for being "habitual drunkards" neither should an alcohol addict be punished for being publicly intoxicated, since such intoxication is merely a symptom of the underlying addictive disease. Certainly if you cannot punish a man for having a common cold, neither can you punish him for sneezing.

In view of these principles, in the Summer of 1966 this Office took the position that incarceration of "habitual drunkards" in the House of Correction was illegal. Accordingly, an arrangement was made with the Defender Association of Philadelphia under which this Office agreed to the release, subject to court supervision, of any person incarcerated in the House of Correction as a habitual drunkard so long as that person desired his release and was physically well enough to be released.

Although this arrangement was a step in the right direction, it could not alleviate the underlying problem of the lack of a rational and humane city-wide treatment program for the chronic alcoholic. To find a permanent solution to the problem, this Office entered into discussions with the Greater Philadelphia Movement, the Philadelphia Diagnostic and Relocation Service Corporation, the Defender Association of Philadelphia, and other interested agencies.

A test case

To awaken the community to the vast problem of alcoholism, it was decided that a law suit should be brought challenging the constitutionality of the treatment in Philadelphia of chronic alcoholics. Two men, Robert Edward Lee and Joseph Mitsch, were selected as test cases, and the Defender Association filed petitions for writs of habeas corpus asking their release on the ground that their commitment to the House of Correction was unconstitutional.

The cases were heard before the Honorable Leo Weinrott, Judge of the Court of Common Pleas No. 5, Philadelphia County, and extensive psychiatric and medical evidence was presented on the nature of alcoholism and the dimensions of the Philadelphia problem. On August 31, 1967, Judge Weinrott rendered a learned and comprehensive opinion declaring that chronic alcoholism is a disease not punishable as a crime, and discharging the petitioners from custody. *Commonwealth of Pennsylvania ex rel. Robert Edward Lee and Joseph Mitsch v. Edward J. Hendricks, Superintendent, Philadelphia County Prisons*, C.P. No. 5, June Term, 1967, No. H.C.-0075, 0076.

Programming humane treatment of alcoholics

Shortly after Judge Weinrott's decision, the District Attorney called a meeting of experts and leading citizens to discuss the impact of the court decision, and new directions for the future. After lengthy discussion, during which there was general agreement that alcoholism should be treated as a medical

and not a criminal problem and that community resources should be devoted to its solution, a sub-committee was formed to achieve a workable city-wide program. The Committee is chaired by Assistant District Attorney Alan J. Davis and its membership includes:

Stanley J. Brody, Director, Southeast Region, Department of Public Welfare.

Ephraim Gomberg, Executive Vice President, Philadelphia Crime Commission.

Edward J. Hendricks, Superintendent, Philadelphia County Prisons.

Dr. Walter Lear, Deputy Commissioner of Health.

Abraham J. Brem Levy, Esquire, Philadelphia Bar Association.

Chief Inspector Frank Nolan, Philadelphia Police Department.

Irving Shandler, Director, The Philadelphia Diagnostic and Relocation Service Corporation.

From the outset, the Philadelphia Police Department, through both Commissioner Frank Rizzo and Chief Inspector Nolan, made it very clear that the Department was 100% behind any program for the more humane treatment of chronic alcohol addicts as persons suffering from a medical problem. At all the meetings of the subcommittee the Police Department volunteered constructive suggestions and all of their resources to the solution of the problem.

After several meetings it was decided that any program for the treatment of alcoholics would require facilities for diagnosis, detoxification, hospitalization, psycho-social evaluation and both in-patient and out-patient long-term rehabilitation. While initially it was thought that this should be done through a large central facility, all of the experts agreed that the best possible program would be a decentralized program which would involve the participation of a large number of general hospitals and all of the varied existing resources in the community.

It is believed that this approach precludes the possibility that a large central facility would become merely a dumping ground for alcoholics offering more humane but no more effective treatment. Moreover, only by involving the staffs of great hospitals can a professional cadre be developed to assure the continuing operation and improvement of the program. Finally, a large number of facilities spread throughout the city will be more responsive to particular neighborhood and sectional problems.

Accordingly, Irving Shandler was instructed by the Committee to enter into discussions with the major hospitals and community mental health centers to obtain their cooperation. Happily, Mr. Shandler's efforts were rewarded with a large measure of success. Although there was strong initial resistance, gradually most of the facilities expressed sympathy and volunteered bed space and personnel for the program.

A pilot program

To obtain the precise data needed for an operational alcoholism program, it was decided that a pilot study was in order. Under a grant from the Greater Philadelphia Movement, the Diagnostic Center undertook a study of all of the men arrested in the 6th Police District between the hours of 2:00 P.M. and 10:00 P.M. for a 10-day period. The Police Department volunteered a breathalyzer machine and operator, the facilities of the 6th Police District, a specially equipped clinic room in the police station, all of the necessary transportation and the full cooperation of all of the men in the district.

The Diagnostic Corporation provided doctors, technicians and social workers. For 10 days the 6th Police District became a diagnostic center for chronic alcoholics.

A report on alternatives to arrest for intoxication

On November 29, 1967, the Diagnostic Corporation issued a 74-page report summarizing the results of the 10-day pilot study, and a comprehensive, detailed city-wide program on alcoholism.

Basically, the plan is to divide the city into four sections, each with a diagnostic center located at four different general hospitals. All persons arrested for public intoxication would be taken by the police directly to these centers. If the arrested person is diagnosed by a doctor as a chronic alcoholic, he would then be treated and either released on out-patient care or provided with in-patient care. If the person is not a chronic alcoholic but rather merely a casual drunk, he will be returned to the police station and be charged according to law. The most significant finding of this study was that existing facilities in the City of Philadelphia are adequate to handle the entire problem with the full cooperation of the City Health Department and the major hospitals.

A general accord

Since the completion of the pilot study, several meetings have been held to which all interested state, local and civic agencies were invited. Without exception, all parties agreed that the plan recommended in the report was feasible and desirable. Most encouraging, was the agreement by Dr. Walter Lear, Deputy Commissioner of the City Health Department, that the Health Department would be willing to assume responsibility for and expedite the program.

Having obtained the very tangible cooperation of the Philadelphia Police Department, various civic agencies, firmly-promised cooperation of many of our great hospitals and the City Health Department, it seems that Philadelphia is on the brink of achieving the finest program for chronic alcoholics in the United States. This has not occurred a moment too soon. The United States Supreme Court now has under consideration in *Powell v. Texas*, the question whether alcoholism should be treated as a disease on a nationwide basis. It is anticipated that the Supreme Court's decision will be the same as Judge Weinrott's decision in the Philadelphia test case. When the decision is handed down, it is anticipated that all communities in the nation will be required to adopt alcoholism programs. With the advanced start that we have, Philadelphia should be one of the leaders in the nation.

EXCHANGE OF OFFICIALS BETWEEN FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION AND PHARMACEUTICAL INDUSTRY

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the Chicago Sun-Times of Sunday, February 25, 1968, published a very interesting article by Morton Mintz which discussed the exchange of officials between the Food and Drug Administration and the pharmaceutical industry.

Mr. Mintz quotes Dr. Louis Lasagna, of the Johns Hopkins Medical School, as follows:

It does not seem desirable to have in decision-making positions scientists who consciously or unconsciously are always contemplating the possibility that their futures may be determined by their rapport with industry.

Mr. Mintz makes the point that although the drain of regulatory officials to industry and the questions it raises about keeping public policy and administration uncorrupted are not unique to the FDA, this agency bears special responsibility in matters affecting the pub-

lic health—often in matters of life and death.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DRUG FIRMS HIRE AWAY FDA OFFICIALS

(By Morton Mintz)

WASHINGTON.—Six years ago, Dr. Louis Lasagna of Johns Hopkins Medical School called the exchange of officials between the Food and Drug Administration and the companies it regulates the "potentially most dangerous aspect of the FDA setup."

"It does not seem desirable to have in decision-making positions scientists who consciously or unconsciously are always contemplating the possibility that their futures may be determined by their rapport with industry," Dr. Lasagna said in his book "The Doctors' Dilemmas."

Four years ago, Rep. Melvin Laird of Wisconsin, chairman of the House Republican Conference, wrote a letter to the commissioner of the FDA, who was then George P. Larrick.

POOR PUBLIC POLICY

"... It is poor public policy to allow individuals... who are vested with broad discretionary authority to arm themselves with extensive information on a group of sharply competing businesses, then suddenly bob up working for one of them," Laird said.

In the letter, which he put into the hearing record of a House appropriations subcommittee, Laird went on to say:

"It also stands to reason that while still employed by FDA and while still passing on the problems of competing companies, they were in the process of agreeing to this outside employment."

NO FOLLOWTHROUGH

An FDA tabulation made at Laird's request showed that of 813 employees who had left FDA in the four years through 1963, at least 83 appeared to have taken posts in regulated industries.

The drain of regulatory officials to industry and the questions it raises about keeping public policy and administration uncorrupted are, of course, not unique to the FDA. But this agency happens to deal with the nation's most profitable industry and to bear responsibility in matters affecting the public health—often, indeed, in matters of life and death.

There was no followthrough, however, on the concerns voiced by Dr. Lasagna and Laird. Traffic on what Lasagna called "the well-traveled two-way street between industry and Washington" went on to reach rush-hour proportions two years ago, and its effects can still be seen.

CLUSTER OF RESIGNATIONS

In a cluster of resignations set off by the late 1965 departure of Commissioner Larrick and his replacement by Dr. James L. Goddard, the most notable was that of Dr. Joseph F. Sadusk, Jr., FDA's top physician and director of the Bureau of Medicine.

In his two years at FDA, Dr. Sadusk had made numerous decisions about drugs. One involved Chloramphenicol, a potent "wonder" antibiotic that some prescribed.

Following a review by a special panel of the National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council, the FDA had already added a warning to the label emphasizing an association between the drug and aplastic anemia, a usually fatal blood disease. But reports continued to flow into the agency of more cases of aplastic anemia among the drug's users, raising the question of how adequate the warning was.

NO ACTION TAKEN

The special panel stood ready to reconvene on the matter, and it was tentatively on the agenda for a 1965 meeting between the NAS-

NRC and FDA officials. But Chloramphenicol never came up.

The FDA delegation was led by Sadusk, who as head of the Bureau of Medicine was responsible for the decision not to attempt a new, still more cautious labeling.

After quitting the FDA in March, 1966, Dr. Sadusk spent a year at Johns Hopkins and then moved to Parke Davis & Co. as vice president for medical affairs. Parke, Davis held a patent monopoly on Chloramphenicol—which it marketed under the brand name of Chloromycetin—during Sadusk's tenure at the FDA.

HEARINGS BRING ACTION

As a result of hearings in the last few weeks by Sen. Gaylord Nelson (D-Wis.), the FDA at last is in the process of requiring tough new labeling for Chloramphenicol. The FDA expects Dr. Sadusk to counsel Parke, Davis on the matter.

He has already represented the firm in other dealings with the agency, although there is no evidence that Parke, Davis was either helped or hurt by being represented by the FDA's former top physician.

Last January Dr. Sadusk met with agency brass about their objections to the expensive promotional campaign that introduced Ponstel, a painkiller, to the American market last year. The firm agreed to send an embarrassing "corrective letter" to some 288,000 doctors saying that the agency regarded certain Ponstel promotions as "misleading."

JOINS TRADE ASSOCIATION

After Dr. Sadusk quit the FDA, the deputy director of the bureau of medicine, Dr. Joseph M. Pisani, went to the Proprietary Assn., the trade organization of manufacturers of nonprescription drugs.

The vacant directorship in the bureau was filled by Dr. Robert J. Robinson, who shortly thereafter moved to a high executive post at Hoffman-La Roche. Joining him in the staff of the pharmaceutical firm was Dr. Grace Pierce, an FDA medical officer.

Dr. Harold Anderson found a job at Winthrop Laboratories more attractive than being director of FDA's Division of Anti-infective Drugs. Dr. Howard Cohn quit as chief of the medical evaluation branch to go to Ciba Pharmaceutical Co.

ORDERS, "BAIL OUT"

Morris Yakowitz, head of the Division of Case Supervision, joined Smith Kline & French Laboratories. Allen E. Rayfield became a consultant to Richardson-Merrell Inc.

As head of FDA's Bureau of Regulatory Compliance, Rayfield had been scored in hearings held by the House Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee. There had been a potentially serious mix-up of labels for medical products at another pharmaceutical plant, Abbott Laboratories. Three FDA inspectors began an investigation to see if there had been violations of the rules for manufacturing practices. One morning soon after the inspectors went into the plant, Rayfield phoned FDA's Chicago Office. "Bail out" he ordered. "Get out before noon."

In his 1964 letter Laird said that Congress had "faced-up" to the underlying problem long ago in respect to the Defense Dept.

TWO-YEAR RULE

"A statute was passed prohibiting career personnel from working on defense matters for private industry until at least two years had passed following their retirement," Laird said.

"I am strongly inclined toward a requirement of this same kind in respect to FDA personnel, forbidding their employment, for a period of two years after leaving FDA, by a company whose business is under FDA jurisdiction."

The inclination has not been strong enough to get anything done.

SALE OF WHEAT BY FRANCE TO RED CHINA

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, recently an announcement was made of a sale of wheat by France to Red China which has very serious implications for the United States.

The net effect of the sale is that the U.S. exporter is subsidizing French sales of wheat to Red China.

This sale, which amounted to 500,000 tons of wheat, was made possible by a \$63-a-ton subsidy paid by the European Economic Community to the French. This made the price paid by the Chinese only about half the European Economic Community's internal price.

For the United States, the crucial point is that the subsidy is paid out of the European Common Market's agricultural fund. This fund is made up in large part by the fees collected from the so-called variable levy system.

In other words, when the United States sells its wheat, corn, and soybeans to the Common Market, the heavy variable levy tax imposed on these shipments goes into the European Economic Community's common agricultural fund. This fund was used in this sale to subsidize French wheat exports to Red China.

I am very disturbed about this. A special subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations will soon be holding hearings on the International Grains Agreement. Certainly this situation will have to be a subject of careful consideration by our committee.

It should also be of interest to the Committee on Finance, of which I am a member, when we discuss legislation involving international trade.

I ask unanimous consent that several newspaper clippings which describe the French deal with Red China be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Journal of Commerce, Jan. 12, 1968]

EEC IMPORT LEVY SYSTEM DRAWS FIRE

WASHINGTON, January 11.—Agriculture Secretary Orville L. Freeman, today said that although trade barriers have been progressively lowered in postwar years, there is a disturbing disposition on the part of some countries to set aside conventional trade rules.

Unless this trend is halted the secretary stressed, the U.S. will be forced to retaliate, and that will mean contracting instead of expanding trade. The secretary spoke at a Propeller Club luncheon here.

He said that the European Economic Community has, for example, "set up a system under which its high cost production is carefully protected from outside competition by variable import levies."

COMMODITY SURPLUSES

"The result, as many predicted, has been the accumulation of commodity surpluses. To dispose of these the EEC is paying export subsidies out of funds generated from the import levies."

According to Mr. Freeman, export subsidies currently are in effect on the EEC's ham, fresh pork, lard, poultry, butter, tomato products, and perhaps a few others.

"So now," the secretary stressed, "we are looking into possibilities of assessing countervailing duties on such products as hams, to compensate for the subsidies low prices."

Subsidized EEC products also are disrupt-

ing foreign markets in which the U.S. sells such as poultry markets, which have been hard hit by subsidized EEC imports in Switzerland and Greece.

The secretary noted, however, the EEC isn't alone in this practice. He said Japan, for example, will permit only a trickle of imported citrus fruit to enter.

[From the Journal of Commerce, Jan. 15, 1968]

CCC EXPORT-IMPORT POSITION IN GRAIN

(By Trader)

A recent article in a West German publication points out that from last July 1 through Dec. 20 the EEC issued export certificates for 1,763,800 metric tons of bread wheat produced in the Common Market countries. French wheat accounted, by far, for the major portion.

During the same period, import certificates totalling 1,534,900 tons of bread wheat were issued, making the EEC a net exporter of this grain for the period of 228,900 metric tons. Statistics refer only to trade with countries outside the community.

For durum wheat, however, only 4,622 tons were listed for export while import certificates reached 693,166 tons. Thus, the combined bread and durum wheat export certificates fell short of import certificates by approximately 460,000 tons, hardly an encouraging balance for countries outside the EEC which in the past have supplied very substantial quantities to the community.

And if recent negotiations for the sale of French wheat to Mainland China and the Near East are successfully concluded another 600,000 tons of wheat or more would be added to the EEC export total.

The EEC also has been an exporter of barley on balance—not unexpected in view of expanded French production of this grain but for other grains imports top exports by a wide margin.

For instance, corn import certificates for the period reviewed exceeded 3.5 million tons while export certificates approximated 501,000 and totals for grain sorghums were about 479,000 and 38,000 tons, respectively.

[From the Journal of Commerce, Oct. 20, 1967]

FRENCH WHEAT SURPLUS AT 5 MILLION TONS

(By Trader)

The French wheat crop turned out very satisfactorily this year after some earlier doubts as to quantity and quality and it has been estimated that an exploratory surplus of about five million metric tons (184 million bushels) was realized after allowance for a moderate carryover at the end of this season of close to 30 million bushels.

Production topped 14 million tons (514 million bushels) and of this it has been estimated that over 400 million bushels will be available off the farm, including moderate imports such as durum wheat which comprises a very small portion of the French crop.

French consumption of wheat for flour and for denaturing for feeding purposes is expected to account for around 213 million bushels. Scattered export sales have been reported but the major portion of the surplus is yet to be sold.

France also is estimated to have a barley exportable surplus of about three million tons (138 million bushels) from a production of over 9.5 million tons (436 million bushels).

The corn crop in France apparently is turning out less satisfactorily than expected earlier due to drought in some sections but, despite setbacks, recent estimates indicate that from a 3.5 million ton production and import of possibly 400,000 tons (a combined total of 154 million bushels) an exportable surplus of 1.1 million tons (43.3 million bushels) should be available.

[From the Journal of Commerce, Oct. 20, 1967]

EEC GRAIN HARVEST SEEN AT NEW PEAK

CHICAGO, October 19.—USDA reported that preliminary estimates based on individual country data indicated that the European Economic Community (EEC) will harvest 67 million metric tons of grain this year (66.2 million excluding rice). This estimate—which exceeds some projections for 1970—compares with about 59 million in 1966 and the previous record of 61.1 million in 1965.

It is estimated that coarse grain production will reach 32 million tons—the previous high in the past 5-years was 28.4 million in 1963. Coarse grain acreage totaled 24.4 million acres in 1967, compared with 23.5 million a year earlier. The increased area went to barley and corn. The barley yield is calculated at a record 1.4 tons per acre, but the corn yield is expected to fall below the unusually high 1966 level of 1.6 tons.

The wheat harvest is estimated at 30 million tons, slightly below the record 30.5 million in 1965. Wheat acreage in 1967 totaled 24.2 million acres, down about 2.5 per cent from 1966, and yield is calculated at 1.2 metric tons per acre. During 1962–66, yields ranged from 1.0 to 1.1 metric tons per acre.

Generally excellent weather throughout the EEC had a very favorable impact on grain yields this year. The effect of higher rates of fertilizer application and other variables on production levels cannot be assessed at this time.

[From the Journal of Commerce, Dec. 27, 1967]

EEC GRAIN EXPORTS, IMPORTS ESTIMATED (By Trader)

A recent provisional estimate by the authority places EEC exports of grains in the current season at 8.5 million metric tons, including 5.2 million tons of soft wheat, 1.7 million tons of barley and 1.2 million tons of corn. Of the balance, hard wheat is expected to account for 110,000 tons, sorghum 80,000, oats 76,000, and rye 16,000 tons.

France will be, by far, the major contributor with that country slated to export 3.5 million tons of soft wheat, barley 1.5 million, and corn 300,000 tons. West Germany is expected to export 800,000 tons of soft wheat, a combined corn and barley total of around 100,000 tons, and small quantities of rye, sorghum, and oats. Prospective exports by Holland are placed at 300,000 tons of soft wheat and corn plus 40,000 tons of oats.

Imports from countries outside the community have been projected at 17.2 million tons. Of this corn will account for more than one-half with 9.6 million tons; soft wheat 2.7 million; hard wheat 1.3 million; sorghum 1.5 million; barley 1.2 million; oats 627,000, and rye 150,600 tons.

Italy will account for 5.0 million tons of the corn imported as well as 500,000 and 400,000 tons of soft and hard wheat, respectively, 900,000 barley and 200,000 tons of oats. West Germany will import 1.5 million tons of corn, 1.0 million tons of soft wheat, 440,000 tons of hard wheat plus approximately 1.0 million tons of other grains. Holland is expected to take 2.0 million tons of corn plus 600,000 tons of other grains.

Partly offsetting exports by France will be imports estimated at 450,000 tons of hard wheat, 400,000 tons of corn, 200,000 tons of soft wheat, and small quantities of other grains.

[From the Journal of Commerce, Jan. 9, 1968]

FRANCE TO SELL WHEAT TO CHINA

PARIS, January 8.—France is to sell China possibly 660,000 tons of wheat, usually reliable grain trade sources in Paris state. Recent reports had placed this potential at at least 500,000 tons with some projections considerably higher.

Top world wheat prices are now thought to be falling from their recent peak and are

in any case some £5 or £6 a ton below current French producer prices. So the shipments to China will be subsidized by the Common Market authorities.

The deal with China, if confirmed and the forerunner of something bigger, is timely. France was a highly active wheat exporter between 1963 and 1965 when Communist countries were seeking a lot of Western grain. But in the 1966–67 season shipments were at only about half the previous season's rate of some 2.8 million tons.

Since then the 1967–68 wheat harvest has been estimated at about 10.75 million tons. This is below the average of about 13 million tons for the '60s so far. But it is expected to give a much larger export surplus than before because of the recent lack of export demand and large carryover.

Paris authorities believe the exportable surplus will be at least 4.7 million tons—of which all but 700,000 tons will have to be sold outside the Common Market.

[From the Journal of Commerce, Jan. 16, 1968]

WILL COST \$10 MILLION: FRENCH-CHINESE DEAL HITS ITALIAN OPPOSITION

ROME, January 15.—France's negotiations for sale of 600,000 tons of wheat to China is raising complaints here that Italy will have to pay out about \$10 million of a \$40 million sales subsidy approved by the Common Market to help Paris close the deal. The market's Executive Commission plans paying French exporters \$62.95 a metric ton to fill the gap between high wheat prices inside the European Community and the low world price being discussed with Peking.

Beside the normal \$52 per ton in subsidy given for grain exports by the EEC, the French shippers would get another \$11 a ton that Italian agricultural agencies consider an "extraordinary subsidy" to help France outbid Canada and New Zealand for the Chinese sale.

REALIZING FULL PRICE

With the support price inside the Common Market at about \$105 a ton, an Italian farm spokesman complained, France can offer its wheat at little more than \$40 a ton to China, "realizing the full price while selling at less than cost."

"It is not clear whether the European Community intends to support, with the concession of the extraordinary subsidy, a political operation or an economic transaction," he said. "It is known to all that France already in past years turned in preference toward China for sale of surplus wheat."

Apart from this proposed sale of wheat, Italian farm spokesmen are not happy generally with the working of the Common Market's farm fund.

"What stuns us more is that the European Community did not take into account the imbalance already existing inside FEOGA (Farm Subsidy Fund) between payments made to the fund and subsidies received by individual countries," the farm spokesman said.

For the years 1962–63 through 1966–67, he said Italy has received \$108 million, while France got \$490 million and Holland \$167 million.

The market's subsidy fund is mainly financed by levies on food imports from third countries. The fund could be handling up to \$2 billion a year by 1969.

"The situation is worsening as Italy has become a heavy importer of food products in recent years," the spokesman added, "to the extent that its total payments into FEOGA are held to have reached about one-third of the over-all contributions."

West Germany, another heavy food importer, and Italy are the biggest payers into the EEC farm fund. Emilio Colombo, Italian treasury minister, visited Bonn recently and proposed action on changing the system of contributions.

The talks are tied to payments into the EEC farm fund due from member countries during January. For the 1965–66 farm year Italy owes \$29 million, West Germany \$45, Belgium \$6.5 and Luxembourg \$300,000, while France will receive \$50 million and Holland \$31 million.

Beside paying out subsidies the farm fund also has an "orientation" sector that finances agricultural modernization in member countries.

Italy will receive subsidy payments from succeeding farm campaigns for olive oil, fruits and vegetables but the belief here is that these will not offset subsidies for French and Dutch food production.

The farm sector here is pushing for a change in operation of the fund so that greater payments will be made from Brussels for modernizing backward Italian agriculture.

[From the Journal of Commerce, Feb. 14, 1968]

FRANCE SELLS WHEAT

PARIS, February 13.—France will sell 500,000 tons of wheat to communist China, the government announced today after long negotiations.

The wheat will be delivered under a special formula developed by the Common Market to help take wheat off a heavily overstocked European grain market. The European Community will pay the French exporters an extra 55 francs (\$11) per ton above the price paid by the Chinese.

French officials said the deal was concluded only after the Chinese agreed to drop efforts to tie a French purchase of pork from China to the wheat sale. They said they refused to buy 10,000 tons of meat offered by China because of "sanitary" and "social-economic" reasons.

THE LONG AMENDMENT IS NOT A SUBSTITUTE FOR A GOOD FEDERAL GUN CONTROL LAW

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, as a strong and consistent supporter of Federal gun control legislation, I should like to make the record clear on my vote yesterday against the Long amendment to the pending civil rights bill dealing with the transportation of firearms in interstate commerce.

I much regret the Senate's hasty action yesterday in approving this amendment with no hearings and with very limited debate. Our colleagues in the Committee on the Judiciary have before them a carefully drawn bill which has received months, if not years, of intensive study. I strongly support that bill; I am one of its cosponsors. I believe that it provides reasonable and effective regulations on the dissemination of firearms. I also believe that it is well designed to give full protection to the rights of the legitimate hunter, shooter and sportsman.

Where are the guarantees of the Long amendment? Where is the evidence of sober and thoughtful consideration?

Mr. President, the Long amendment is not a substitute for a good and carefully considered Federal firearms control law. I hope the American people will not be misled into thinking that we do not need to act on the gun bill because of the Long amendment. That is one of the reasons I opposed the amendment. I urge Senators to move ahead as swiftly as possible to bring to the floor of the Senate and pass the Federal gun control bill now pending in the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUPPORT NEEDED FOR COLLEGE LEVEL "COOPERATIVE EDUCATION" PROGRAMS

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to some important testimony presented yesterday to the Special Subcommittee on Education in the House of Representatives. The topic under consideration was cooperative education, a growing concept now in being in well over 100 institutions of higher education in this country.

Because cooperative education has proved itself as a valuable means for combining practical and academic experience; because it affords another avenue for those enrolled in its programs to earn a large part of their academic expenses; and because there is a great need to expand the program to more of our colleges, universities, and technical institutes, I offered last May 10, with the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] as the principal Republican cosponsor, an amendment to title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965, to provide a spur to these college-industry cooperative education programs. That bill, S. 1736, has received attention from the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and I am hopeful that in the final enactment of this year's higher education bill the provisions for strengthening cooperative education will be a significant part of its usefulness. I know that the support of the 18 cosponsors now associated with me in my bill, including that of some committee members, augurs well for its enactment.

Witnesses at yesterday's hearing, which was presided over for the day by my Indiana colleague, Representative JOHN BRADEMAs, included highly relevant statements presented out of their experience by three presidents of institutions which now have cooperative education programs, in which the students alternate between periods of academic work and periods of employment for pay in a related field through the cooperation of employers. I might add that employers, and in particular those who can gear to a technical or scientific student's education, are often most enthusiastic. In fact, in some areas of the country, so successful is the program that the institution has a waiting list of available jobs larger than the list of students available. A fourth witness was John L. Cain, past chairman of the cooperative education division of the American Society for Engineering Education, speaking for himself and James Godfrey, present president of the Cooperative Education Association.

These two organizations concerned with cooperative education together have a membership of some 1,500, including faculty members of institutions with such a program, together with industrial, business, and governmental agency representatives. Some 56,000 students in their alternate periods of full-time employment away from the classroom earn \$95 million in a year—a degree of self-help which encourages many from lower income families to tackle higher education when otherwise, afraid of going into

what appears as large indebtedness, they would not go beyond high school. More than 3,000 American companies, Government agencies, and public service institutions employ work-study cooperative education students in a wide range of fields. The kind of encouragement which my bill advocates, and that to which the House testimony refers, could well lead to a tripling of these self-help better education programs within 5 years. I have said "better education" deliberately, because one of the great benefits is just that, as the student gears the experience of the practical world to the theory of the classroom and at the end of his course—commonly 5 years with a summer program as a functional part of it—his degree stands for much more of a recommendation to future employers than it would without the work experience. In fact, this better education bonus is one of the features which educators themselves with experience in this field continually stress.

For example, one of yesterday's witnesses was Dr. Rembert E. Stokes, president of Wilberforce University in Ohio. Wilberforce, the Nation's oldest predominantly Negro college, adopted cooperative education in the fall of 1964 with the help of the Ford Foundation and a private donor, a considerable change for an institution more than 100 years old. It is now the only mainly Negro college where cooperative education is the full-scale, required program. With a present enrollment of just under 1,000 students—up from 415 in 1964—earnings during this academic year will come close to \$1 million. I quote the following from Dr. Stokes' testimony:

Enough experience has been accumulated to know the profound educational improvement in the lives of our students and to predict the following education outcome from their Cooperative work-study experiences.

1. Dispelling of doubt and disbelief that real, new career opportunities exist.
2. Fresh motivation for the student to pursue his education through study and related experiences.
3. Development of a new pride and belief in oneself through practical achievement.
4. Usable knowledge of the requirements, expectations and rewards of being a productive member of society, including for many the stimulation to preparation for higher professional careers.
5. Greater facility for understanding how to live effectively in a complex society.
6. Creation of a campus environment which stimulates the development of the faculty and constructive changes in the growth of the college.

To me, Mr. President, from the president of such an institution as Wilberforce, these conclusions of experience provide powerful buttressing to all the arguments I have made in the past as I have advocated this form of education both here and elsewhere.

The proposal I have made, and that which the House subcommittee is considering, provides for the expansion of this program through Federal "startup" funds to the many institutions which have become interested in this educational concept but which have not found it possible to incur the costs of change. We cannot leave the Ford Foundation or other private sources to be, as in the

case of Wilberforce, the burden bearers of educational improvement by this means.

Provisions of grants, whether limited to \$65,000 as in my bill, or \$75,000 as in the House proposal, or some even larger sum, would actually become an investment, not a longrun cost. The reason is that as the earnings of students in new programs rise, with each of them becoming subject to income tax on a portion of their earnings, they will become taxpayers rather than receivers of subsidy as, for example, under the college loan program in which the Government pays all of the interest cost while they are in school.

Dr. Dewey Barich, president of Detroit Institute of Technology, testified yesterday that the proposed amendments to the Higher Education Act involved in this support of cooperative education would enable 400 additional institutions to move vigorously into cooperative education and to offer opportunity under it to 250,000 more students. In 6 to 8 years their earnings while in school would amount to more than \$500 million per year. With the average tax running at 10 percent of the student's gross pay, this means a new \$50 million per year income—far and away more than the program's startup costs to the Federal Government would be.

Earlier I cited some figures, taken from my statement on the introduction of S. 1736 less than a year ago. I note, however, that even without Government assistance they are already out of date. Where I cited then 112 institutions with such programs, the number is now 119, according to Dr. Barich. Where I then said 56,000 students were earning \$95 million annually, Dr. Barich updates this to 61,000 earning \$104 million this year. The idea is spreading, most deservedly. We in Congress can and should help it to spread by giving full backing to my bill or whatever variant may be recommended by the committees of both House and Senate as part of the Higher Education Act revisions of 1968.

NONTARIFF BARRIERS

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, the official trade policy of the United States, as embodied in the Trade Expansion Act, is directed toward the reduction of tariff barriers and the encouragement of free trade between nations. The administration applied that policy in the negotiations leading to the trade concessions under the Kennedy round in Geneva.

I have mixed feelings about the application of our trade policy. In a number of instances I do not think our policymakers and trade negotiators have given sufficient weight to the problems confronting our industries which face floods of low-wage imports. In addition, I have wondered about the impact of nontariff barriers on our capacity to sell our goods overseas. Negotiations have tended to focus on the visible tariff barriers and to ignore invisible barriers which may be much more formidable.

To assist me in making a judgment on tariff laws and their effects on our economy, I requested from Mr. William Roth, special representative for trade negotiation in the Executive Office of the Presi-

dent, an inventory of the nontariff barriers imposed by the various countries of the world. I believe this information will be of interest to my colleagues. Although the data are not complete, these listings reflect the nontariff barriers on industrial products imposed by 52 of the 79 countries that adhere to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

Mr. Roth has advised me that his office is revising the inventory and is "endeavoring to obtain information on nontariff barriers for all the GATT countries." He has promised to forward that information as soon as possible.

On March 25, 1968, Mr. Roth will begin a public hearing on the future of U.S. trade policy. He has noted:

One of the topics on which we are encouraging interested parties to submit their views is measures that may constitute nontariff barriers to trade. There is much to be done in this area and we are very concerned about this serious problem.

I am gratified by Mr. Roth's interest and concern with this facet of trade policy.

I ask unanimous consent that the preliminary inventory of the nontariff barriers be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRELIMINARY INVENTORY OF NONTARIFF TRADE BARRIERS BY COUNTRY

The attached Tables 1 through 52 are an initial attempt to list the more important non-tariff trade barriers on industrial products imposed by the 52 countries listed

below. They were compiled on the basis of reports and complaints received by Government agencies from the business community and other information relating to nontariff trade barriers. This preliminary inventory does not purport to be either comprehensive or accurate in all respects.

As indicated above, this preliminary inventory is limited to industrial products. With the exception of certain processed goods, such as alcoholic beverages and tobacco products, agricultural products are not included. The information presented is divided into three general classifications for each of the countries covered: "Non-Agricultural Quantitative Restrictions", "Health, Sanitary and Safety Restrictions", and "Other Restrictions".

The tabulations are included in Tables 1 through 52, as follows:

EUROPE

1. Austria
2. Belgium-Luxembourg
3. Denmark
4. Finland
5. France
6. Germany
7. Greece
8. Italy
9. Netherlands
10. Norway
11. Portugal
12. Spain
13. Sweden
14. United Kingdom

WESTERN HEMISPHERE

15. Argentina
16. Brazil
17. Canada
18. Chile

19. Dominican Republic
20. Haiti
21. Nicaragua
22. Peru
23. Trinidad and Tobago
24. Uruguay
25. Australia
26. Indonesia
27. Japan
28. Korea
29. Malaysia
30. New Zealand

FAR EAST

NEAR EAST-SOUTH ASIA

31. Burma
32. Ceylon
33. Cyprus
34. India
35. Israel
36. Kuwait
37. Pakistan
38. Turkey

AFRICA

39. Cameroon
40. Central African Republic
41. Chad
42. Congo (Brazzaville)
43. Gabon
44. Ghana
45. Kenya, Tanzania, Uganda
46. Malawi
47. Nigeria
48. Sierra Leone
49. South Africa
50. Southern Rhodesia
51. Upper Volta
52. Zambia

TABLE 1.—AUSTRIA

Product	Type of restriction
Nonagricultural quantitative restrictions:	
Controlled goods include such products as:	
a. Antibiotics and medicaments containing antibiotics.	Quantitative import restrictions.
b. Penicillin, tyrothrium.	Do.
Valuation and taxes: All imports.	1. Turnover equalization tax:
	(a) Certain foodstuffs, 1.8 percent.
	(b) Certain semifinished products, 5.25 percent.
	(c) Certain finished products, 6.75 percent.
	(d) Certain other finished products, 8.25 percent.
	2. "Organschaft" principle of turn over tax system.
Health, sanitary, and safety restrictions: Many industrial, canned, and packaged goods.	Industrial standards, marking and labeling requirements.

TABLE 2.—BELGIUM-LUXEMBOURG

Product	Type of restriction
Nonagricultural quantitative restrictions: Coking coal.	Quota, imports are licensed. 1967 quota for U.S. 807,000 metric tons.
Valuation and taxes:	
All imported goods.	Transmission tax or lump-sum tax—generally 7 percent but may vary on certain commodities from 1 to 15 percent.
Automobiles.	Road tax based on fiscal horsepower.
Health and sanitary restrictions: Pharmaceutical products.	Health and sanitary regulations.
Other restrictions:	
Motion picture films.	Subsidy (Belgium).
Anthracite.	Quota, imports are licensed. 1967 overall quota for 3d-country imports, 200,000 maximum. Anticipated 1967 total quota allotments, 185,000 metric tons. Estimated 1967 U.S. quota, 20,000 metric tons. (1966 U.S. quota, 20,000 metric tons.)
Penicillin, its salts and compounds, and products thereof (BLEU).	Benelux global quota. (1966 quota, 2,550,000,000 Oxford units, same as in 1965. 1967 quota presumed to be same as 1966.)
Lignite; coke; semicoke; petroleum and products; certain chemicals; basketwork; a number of textile fibers, yarns, and fabrics; women's synthetic hose; jute sacks; natural and synthetic precious and semiprecious stones and dust; tube, pipe, and hollow bars of gold; zinc plate, sheet, and strip; X-ray apparatus; firearms, other arms and parts; ammunition and military ordnance (BLEU).	Import licensing.

TABLE 3.—DENMARK

Product	Type of restriction
Health, sanitary, and safety restrictions: Electrical equipment, e.g., coffeemakers, toasters, socket-powered radios, TV's, phonographs, etc.	Rigid technical standards.
Other restrictions:	
Pharmaceutical products.	Price-fixing provision of Dispensing Chemist Act.
Approximately 24 products including electrical machinery, certain publications, cleaning powders, furniture, pencils, brushes, building fittings, handtools; wire, nails, and tacks.	Marking regulations.
All products purchased for the public account.	Government procurement practices.
Valuation and taxes:	
Nearly all manufactured goods.	10 percent value-added tax.
Motor vehicles.	Excise tax.

TABLE 4.—FINLAND

Product	Type of restriction
Nonagricultural quantitative restrictions:	
Certain gasoline; some chemicals; certain textile fabrics; some clothing, headgear and footwear; certain articles for household use; certain precious metals; and jewelry; passenger cars, trucks, toys, games.	Global quotas.
Mineral fuels, oils, waxes; coal, briquettes, ovoids; coke, semicoke of coal, lignite; petroleum and shale oils, crude oil, predistilled motor gasoline, heating and lighting fuel.	Import licensing.
Valuation and taxes:	
Nearly all manufactured goods.	Turnover tax—12.4 percent.
Automobiles and motorcycles.	Excise tax—155 percent of c.i.f. duty-paid value minus Fmk 2,250 (\$703).
Alcoholic beverages, confectionery, matches, automobile tires, tobacco products, mineral waters, liquid fuels, sugar, and certain fats for foods.	Excise tax.
Health, sanitary, and safety restrictions:	
Electrical equipment, appliances.	Safety and technical standards.
Pharmaceuticals, drugs, poisons.	Safety standards.
Other restrictions:	
Alcoholic beverages, fertilizers, grains, crude petroleum, radioactive materials.	State trading.
Consumer goods; e.g., washing machines, TV sets, passenger cars, household articles, textiles, footwear, clocks and watches, furniture, tractors, tires. Also a few capital goods; e.g., vending machines.	Credit restrictions.

TABLE 5.—FRANCE

Product	Type of restriction
Non-agricultural quantitative restrictions:	
Assemblies of parts of radioelectric apparatus containing crystal diodes, triodes, including transistors; crystal diodes, triodes, including transistors and parts.	Quotas, import licensing.
Airplanes and parts.	Quotas for airplanes 2,000 kilograms or less, import licensing.
Valuation and taxes:	
Cigarettes.	Monopoly operation.
Automobiles.	Annual usage tax.
Most imports.	"Value added tax" (TVA) standard rate: 25 percent of duty paid value. Rate will become 20 percent as of Jan. 1, 1968, following Government reform of TVA.
All imports.	Customs stamp tax, 2 percent of customs charges.
Health, sanitary, and safety restrictions: Pharmaceutical products.	Approval of French Ministry of Public Health required on both domestic and imported items.
Other restrictions:	
Coal, briquets, ovoids, and similar solid fuels of coal manufacture.	State traded.
Petroleum and shale oils other than crude; preparations.	Do.
Paper, paperboard, and newsprint.	Do.
Airplanes and parts.	Do.
Spirits distilled from grain; i.e., whisky, vodka, etc.	Advertising restriction.
All products purchased for public account.	Government procurement practices.
Motion picture films.	(a) Subsidy. (b) Screen-time quota 41.5 percent.

TABLE 6.—FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

Product	Type of restriction
Nonagricultural quantitative restrictions: Hard coal, not briquetted; briquets and similar solid fuels and coke, except for the manufacture of electrodes.	Subject to tariff quotas; overquota rate is prohibitive.
Valuation and taxes: All manufactured products.	Turnover equalization tax (4 to 9.5 percent).
Other restrictions: Motion picture films.	Subsidy.

TABLE 7.—GREECE

Product	Type of restriction
Nonagricultural quantitative restrictions:	
List A: Products such as cosmetics; textiles, including used clothing; TV receivers; automobiles, trucks, buses, jeeps, special purpose vehicles, and truck and passenger trailers.	Import licensing.
List B: Products such as agricultural, mining, food processing and electrical machinery and spares; used machinery and spares except used earthmoving and roadbuilding equipment.	Do.
All imports.	Advance deposit requirement and other credit controls.
Valuation and taxes:	
All industrial products.	Turnover tax on imports 2.25 to 8.75 percent.
Most imports.	Luxury and consumption taxes ranging from 10 to 70 percent of c.i.f. duty-paid value.
Other restrictions:	
Passenger cars used as taxis.	Permissible length for taxis in Athens-Piraeus area is 5 meters.
Cigarette paper, kerosene.	State trading.
Motion picture films.	Screen-time quota, subsidy.
Plastic containers used in the packing of food products.	Ban on the use of coloring materials.

TABLE 8.—ITALY

Product	Type of restriction
Nonagricultural quantitative restrictions:	
Citric acid and crude calcium citrate.	Import licensing.
Tetraethyl lead and antiknock preparations.	Quota, 240 metric tons (United States-United Kingdom only), import licensing.
Essential oils of lemons.	Import licensing.
Elemental sulfur.	Quantitative import restrictions.
Valuation and taxes:	
Practically all products.	Turnover tax on import sale of 4 percent.
Majority of items imported.	Compensatory import tax of up to 7.8 percent.
Automobiles.	Road tax.
Other restrictions:	
Motion picture films.	Screen-time quota, 38 percent.
Do.	Law which passed in 1965 grants tax rebates to exhibitors of national feature films, qualifying under the national film quota amounting to 18 or 35 percent of the admission tax, depending on the admission price of the theater.

TABLE 9.—NETHERLANDS

Product	Type of restriction
Nonagricultural quantitative restrictions:	
Alcohol and certain other industrial chemicals; penicillin; coal and coke; certain cotton fabrics; artificial textile fibers and certain fabrics thereof; wool and fine hair; flax; hemp; zinc sheets and strips.	Import licensing.
Pencillin, its salts and compounds, and products thereof.	Benelux global quota.
Valuation and taxes:	
All items whether imported or produced domestically, except "necessities of life"—food, fuel, medicine, clothing, etc.	Turnover tax. Rates vary from 1 to 18 percent, the majority being at 5 percent.
Manufactured tobacco products; ethyl, propyl and isopropyl alcohol; beer; sugar; petroleum products; and wine.	Excise tax.
Motor vehicles.	Annual road tax.
Health and sanitary restrictions: Upholstery fabrics, shoe dyes, various pharmaceuticals and cosmetics, and oils and fats.	Certificates of inspection, advertising restrictions, labeling regulations.

TABLE 10.—NORWAY

Product	Type of restriction
Valuation and taxes:	
Nearly all manufactured goods.	Turnover tax, 11.11 percent.
Motor vehicles.	Excise tax on motor vehicles: 35 percent on 1st \$840, 60 percent of amount over \$840. Rigid electrical standards.
Health, sanitary, and safety restrictions: Electricity-consuming apparatus including electrical appliances.	
Other restrictions:	
Alcohol, alcoholic beverages, medicines and pharmaceuticals, fishing gear.	State trading.
All products purchased for the public account.	Government procurement practices.

TABLE 11.—PORTUGAL

Product	Type of restriction
Nonagricultural quantitative restrictions:	
Certain natural or processed raw materials, some textile fibers, automotive vehicles and apparatus, miscellaneous manufactured goods.	Global or bilateral quotas.
All other goods.	Import license.
Valuation and taxes: Automobiles.	Sales tax.
Health, sanitary, and safety restrictions: Pharmaceutical preparations.	Marking and labeling regulations.
Food and other products containing saccharine.	Imports prohibited.
Other restrictions: All purchases for the public account.	Government procurement practices.

TABLE 12.—SPAIN

Product	Type of restriction
Nonagricultural quantitative restrictions:	
All liberalized goods (includes raw materials, capital goods and equipment, manufactured and consumer goods).	Import declaration.
All used machinery and equipment.	Import license.
Arms: Sporting weapons.	Bilateral import regime.
Motion pictures.	"Baremo system" screen-time quota.
All imports other than those listed above.	Global quota or bilateral import regime.
Valuation and taxes:	
All imports.	Compensatory import tax range: 3 to 15 percent; average 5 to 10 percent; assessed on duty-paid value.
Motion pictures.	Dubbing tax.
Health, sanitary, and safety restrictions: Pharmaceutical and cosmetic preparations.	Registration with Public Health Department.
Other restrictions:	
Certain types of coal, petroleum, and derivatives, cotton.	State trading.
All products.	Use of imported goods prohibited in projects involving State or other local government funds; includes national or quasi-national firms.

TABLE 13.—SWEDEN

Product	Type of restriction
Nonagricultural quantitative restrictions: Automobiles, including special vehicles.	Import license.
Valuation and taxes:	
All imports.	Turnover tax, 11.1 percent.
Gasoline, motor spirits, coal, coke, fuel oil.	Energy tax:
	(a) Coal—\$1.14 to \$2.66 per metric ton.
	(b) Gasoline—0.57 crowns per liter. (about 65 percent of retail price).
	(c) Electricity—10 percent on industrial consumption; 7 percent on other use.

TABLE 13.—SWEDEN—Continued

Product	Type of restriction
Valuation and taxes:	
Certain rugs, articles of gold and silver, precious stones, phonograph mechanisms, and records.	Sales tax. Rate varies according to product. Jewelry, 20 percent.
Passenger automobiles, trucks.	Automobile sales tax. 155 percent of service weight expressed in Swedish crowns plus 195 crowns for each 50 kilograms over 1,600 kilograms.
Certain furs.	Fur tax: 2 to 10 percent.
Toilet articles, cosmetics, and similar preparations.	Commodity tax: 20 to 65 percent.
Playing cards.	Stamp tax: \$0.19 per pack.
Health, sanitary, and safety restrictions:	
Electrical equipment and appliances.	Rigid application of electrical standards.
Pharmaceuticals, drugs, and poisons.	Pharmaceutical.
Lawnmowers (motor driven, rotary blade).	Safety regulation.
Other restrictions:	
Spirits and wines.	State trading.
Articles of precious metals.	Hallmarking.
Imports in general.	Marks of origin.

TABLE 14.—UNITED KINGDOM

Product	Type of restriction
Nonagricultural quantitative restrictions:	
Coal and solid fuels manufactures of coal.	State trading (de facto). Import license required. No licenses issued—virtual prohibition of imports.
Cigars.	Quota £50,000 for 1966-67 from dollar area of which not more than £30,000 for hand-made cigars.
Bottled and canned grapefruit.	Dollar area quota of £450,000 for period Oct. 1, 1966, to Sept. 30, 1967.
Orange and grapefruit juice.	Dollar area quota of £300,000 for 12-month period beginning Oct. 1, 1966.
Rum.	Dollar area quota of £90,000 for calendar year.
Other restrictions:	
Motion picture films.	(a) Subsidy. (b) Screen time.
TV films.	Screen time quota: 14 percent for imported films.
Telephone apparatus (exchange equipment, cables, and loading carts).	Government procurement practices.
Timber (Douglas-fir).	Government procurement.
Aircraft weighing more than 4,500 lbs.	Import license required.

TABLE 15.—ARGENTINA

Product	Type of restriction
Nonagricultural quantitative restrictions:	
Automotive products.	Prohibited.
Nearly all imports except raw materials and capital goods.	Prior deposit 40 percent c.i.f.
Capital goods.	Payment schedule prescribed by Central Bank for shipments exceeding \$10,000; minimum payment terms range from 2 years for goods valued up to \$30,000 to 5 years for goods valued up to \$1,000,000.
Valuation and taxes:	
Affecting imported goods:	
All goods.	Statistical tax: 1.5 percent c.i.f.
Do.	Surcharge: 4-percent ocean freight charges.
Do.	Consular fee: 1.5 percent of f.o.b.
Products made of iron and steel.	Iron and steel tax: 0.20 to 2.00 pesos/NK.
Forest products.	4 to 10 percent of c.i.f. value.
Incandescent bulbs.	Minimum official valuation in determining import duty.
Affecting national and imported goods:	
Sales tax:	
Electric shavers.	20 percent duty paid value.
Air conditioners.	
Televisions.	
Radios.	
Phonographs.	
Sound recorders.	
Phonographic equipment.	
Binocular and similar apparatus.	15 percent duty paid value.
Pleasure boats.	
Most automotive products.	
Household electrical goods.	10 percent duty paid value.
Watches.	
All other commodities.	
Additional excise taxes:	
Alcoholic beverages.	These excise taxes range widely and are based on the quantity or strength of the goods sold.
Cards.	
Matches.	
Tobacco and its products.	
Cosmetics.	
Various toys.	
Petroleum products.	
Health, sanitary, and safety restrictions:	
Animals, plants, and their products.	Notarized sanitary certificate.
Pharmaceuticals, cosmetics, foods.	Subject to prior registration in Argentina.
Used machinery.	Notarized certificate of safety.

TABLE 16.—BRAZIL

Product	Type of restriction
Valuation and taxes:	
All imports.	Customs clearance 5 percent of c.i.f. value. Port improvement tax: 1 percent of c.i.f. value.
Wide variety of processed or manufactured goods; e.g., industrial chemicals and chemical products; machinery and mechanical appliances; electric and electronic equipment; automotive and other vehicles; cigarettes.	Merchant marine improvement tax: 10 percent of freight charges.
About 200 items.	Industrialized products tax: 4 percent to 30 percent; majority of rates under 10 percent.
Other restrictions:	
All imported items declared to be "similar" to goods produced domestically.	Minimum valuation.
All imports.	System of "similares" requiring formal registration of specific products.
Motion picture films.	Documentation and procedural requirements.
	Screen-time quota, 12 percent.

TABLE 17.—CANADA

Product	Type of restriction
Nonagricultural quantitative restrictions:	
Aircraft, used.	Import prohibition.
Automobiles, used.	Do.
Valuation and taxes:	
All products.	Automatic antidumping provisions.
Manufactured goods.	Arbitrary valuation.
Health, sanitation, and safety restrictions:	
Forest products, drugs, insecticides, cosmetics, fertilizers, upholstery.	Sanitary regulation.
Electrical equipment.	Safety regulations.
Other restrictions:	
Alcoholic beverages.	Monopoly operated by Canadian Provinces—QR's licensing.
Contractor's machinery and equipment.	Uncertain valuation.
Coal.	Tourist duty-free allowance.
Containers.	Transport subsidy on domestic coal.
	Canned goods are permitted import only if in cans of sizes established by the Canadian Government.

TABLE 18.—CHILE

Product	Type of restriction
Nonagricultural quantitative restrictions:	
Many imports (permitted list).	Advance deposit, 5 to 10,000 percent.
Many imports (prohibited list).	Prohibited list, embargo.
Many imports (not on either list).	Conditionally prohibited.
All imports.	Shipping restriction.
Imports of items included on Chile's LAFTA concession list.	Preferential treatment.

TABLE 19.—DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Product	Type of restriction
Nonagricultural quantitative restrictions:	
All imports.	Exchange control.
Passenger cars valued at over \$2,000.	Import prohibition.
Passenger cars valued at less than \$2,000; most electric household appliances (including used stoves, refrigerators, and freezers), air conditioners, clothing, footwear, and leather goods, cosmetics, alcoholic beverages, fresh and canned fruits and vegetables, paints and enamels, varnishes, soaps and detergents, and most plastic products.	Exchange quotas limiting importers to 25 percent of the foreign exchange total granted during the previous 12-month period; effective until Dec. 31, 1967.
A wide range of luxury goods, including prepared cereals, smoked or dried fish, evaporated and condensed milk, alcoholic beverages, crystal and glassware.	Importable only under prepaid letter of credit.
Wide range of luxury goods, such as household electrical appliances, clothing, footwear, furniture, bedding, jewelry, toilet preparations, alcoholic beverages, confectionery, fruit juices and preserves, cigars and cigarettes, and passenger cars.	Prior import deposit of 40 percent of f.o.b. value for 6-month period.
Most other imports, except essential foodstuffs, medicinal and pharmaceutical goods, agricultural machinery and equipment, most raw materials, and related goods.	Prior import deposit of 20 percent of f.o.b. value for 6-month period.
Wide range of food products.	Prior import deposit of 10 percent of f.o.b. value for 6-month period.

TABLE 20.—HAITI

Product	Type of restriction
Nonagricultural quantitative restrictions:	
Butter and margarine, rice, shoe polish, cotton cloth and manufactures of cotton cloth, old newspapers and other old papers.	Import licensing.
Christmas trees, used clothing, rags, hats, shoes, household linens, and furnishings.	Importation prohibited.
Tobacco, matches, soap, detergents, cosmetics, various foodstuffs, textiles, tires and tubes, cement, various agricultural chemicals, and household appliances.	State trading; such imports are controlled by the Government tobacco monopoly.
Television sets.	Private monopoly.

TABLE 21.—NICARAGUA

Product	Type of restriction
Nonagricultural quantitative restrictions:	
Many imports.	Advance deposit.
Cotton ginning plants; industrial plants for pasteurizing and sterilizing milk; equipment for the slaughter of cattle and hogs, and other slaughterhouse equipment.	Approval for importation by Ministry of Economy required.
Valuation and taxes:	
Gasoline.	Excise tax—C\$0.05 per gallon. ¹
Alcoholic beverages of 40 percent or over.	Excise tax—U.S. \$0.62 per liter.
Beef.	Excise tax—C\$0.60 per liter.
Bottle caps and crown caps.	Excise tax, 2 centavos.
Liquor.	Stamp tax:
	(A) Containers over 500 grams: C\$2.
	(B) Containers, 240 to 500 grams: C\$0.75.
	(C) Containers, less than 240 grams: C\$0.40.
All imports.	Consular fee, 7 percent.
Health, sanitary, and safety restrictions: Propellant powders, prepared explosives, and hunting or sporting ammunition and fuses, primers and detonators (nonordnance) except pyrotechnical articles; caffeine, quinine, and other alkaloids; coloring materials used in beverages and foodstuffs; pharmaceutical specialties and biological products.	Prior authorization.

¹ 7 Cordobas to U.S. \$1.

TABLE 22.—PERU

Product	Type of restriction
Nonagricultural quantitative restrictions: Textile machinery.	Import license.
Valuation and taxes:	
Approximately 50 tariff classifications, with future lists expected soon.	Minimum valuations.
All goods.	Statistical tax: 1.5 percent c.i.f.
Do.	Surcharge: 4 percent ocean freight charges.
Health, sanitary, and safety restrictions: Pharmaceuticals, firearms, explosives and similar items.	Prior authorization required.
Other restrictions: Products produced for public account.	Government procurement practices.

TABLE 23.—TRINIDAD-TOBAGO

Product	Type of restriction
Nonagricultural quantitative restrictions: A large and growing number of home and other consumer products, particularly in textiles, leather and plastic goods and automobile accessories.	Specific import license.

TABLE 24.—URUGUAY

Product	Type of restriction
Nonagricultural quantitative restrictions: Most imports; e.g., automobiles and parts, gas ranges, clocks and watches, gas refrigerators, electric shavers, TV sets, slide projectors, apparel.	Advance deposit requirement.
Valuation and taxes:	
Most goods except essential items of an industrial, agricultural, or medicinal nature.	Balance-of-payments surcharge: 30 to 300 percent.
All imports.	Port handling fee: \$0.25 per 100 kg. of gross weight or \$0.33 per 100 pesos of valuation.
Other restrictions: Most imports.	180-day prohibition.

TABLE 25.—AUSTRALIA

Product	Type of restriction
Nonagricultural quantitative restrictions:	
Roller and ball bearings.	Import licensing.
Secondhand or disposals machinery or equipment and parts for earthmoving or construction purposes.	Do.
Aluminum.	Do.
Valuation and taxes: Wide range (several hundred) of industrial and consumer items.	Sales tax, 12.5 percent.
Other restrictions:	
Cellulose acetate flake.	Subsidy, 10d. per pound.
Sulfuric acid.	Subsidy.
Tractors.	Do.
All packaged goods.	Weights and measures regulations.
Motion picture films.	Screen-time quota.

TABLE 26.—INDONESIA

Product	Type of restriction
Nonagricultural quantitative restrictions:	
No quota restrictions on imports.	Imports handled through exchange certificate system.
Licenses for individual imports no longer required.	Special permit issued by Minister of Trade.
Indonesia has a prohibited list of domestically produced items and some luxury products including:	
Plaiting and carving materials; other raw vegetable materials and products.	
Ethyl alcohol and certain liquids containing ethyl alcohol.	
Black printing ink.	
Prepared paints, other than ship and spray paints.	
Shoe polish.	
Old leather and leather waste.	
Scouring and polishing paper.	
Silk and artificial silk waste; silk and artificial silk shoddy.	
Various textile items such as sarongs, kains, and scarves made of silk, wool, cotton, or other materials.	
Knitted and crocheted cotton articles (vests, pants, shirts).	
Rags and cloth waste.	
Writing and drawing slates.	
Rubber-tapping cups of earthenware and white porcelain.	
Drinking glasses, various other glass bottles, cups, containers.	
Hoes, stickles, picks of iron or steel.	
Certain kitchen utensils of iron or steel (other than enameled ware) or of aluminum including cooking pots, kettles, and casseroles.	
Aluminum tubes used as packing or as bottle stoppers.	
School slates and various writing and drawing equipment.	
Dry batteries (sized about 60 mm. in length; 33 mm. in diameter).	
Radio-television receiving sets not in knocked-down condition.	
6- or 12-volt accumulators, with highest amperage of 150.	
Passenger cars, United States, \$2,000 or more.	
Valuation and taxes:	
All items on GATT schedule.	Special levy (BLD contribution).
All imports.	1-percent BLD levy.
Wide range of nonessential items and domestically produced goods.	Surcharge (50 and 100 percent based on import duty). Excess profit levy (ranging from rupiah 10 to rupiah 200 per U.S. dollar).
Other restrictions: Many essential items, including rice, cloves, cambrics, fertilizers, raw cotton, weaving yarn and thread, textiles and dyes, tinplate, paper cement, reinforcing rods, and other capital goods.	State trading.

TABLE 27.—JAPAN

Product	Type of restriction
Nonagricultural quantitative restrictions: As of March 1967, coal; gas oils, heavy fuel and raw oils, and other petroleum oils; some chemicals and pharmaceutical products; leathers (excluding raw) and leather products, especially footwear; alcoholic beverages; color film; some alloy tool steels; large steam boilers and turbines, some types of diesel engines, and certain large electric generators; internal combustion engines and parts, and certain large electric generators; aircraft and aircraft motors and parts; office machinery including digital type computers and parts; among other items, still remain under the import quota (IQ) licensing system.	Quota-import (licensing).

TABLE 27.—JAPAN—Continued

Product	Type of restriction
Valuation and taxes:	
Whiskey.....	Internal tax of 150 percent on high-priced whiskeys and brandies and tax.
Automobiles.....	Commodity (sales) tax of 15, 30, or 40 percent.
Other restrictions:	
Cigarettes.....	State trading.
Ethyl alcohol.....	Do.
Salt.....	Do.

TABLE 28.—KOREA

Product	Type of restriction
Nonagricultural quantitative restrictions:	
Since July 25, 1967, Korea has had an import plan based on a negative list of items which require licenses under a quota requiring approval of the competent ministry for importation.	(1) Quota, import (licensing).
In addition, there is also a list of items that are prohibited importation. Textiles and textile products, among others, are on the prohibited list.	(2) Prohibition.

TABLE 29.—MALAYSIA

Product	Type of restriction
Nonagricultural quantitative restrictions: Amusement machines, arms and ammunition.	Import licensing.
Other restrictions:	
Motion picture films.....	Screen-time quota.
Goods purchased for the public account.....	"Buy national" policy.
Automobiles.....	Ad valorem registration fee:
	(a) 15 percent for United Kingdom origin.
	(b) 25 percent for other Commonwealth origin and other country.
Trucks and buses used for business or public purposes.	Ad valorem registration fee:
	(a) None for Commonwealth origin.
	(b) 15 percent for non-Commonwealth origin.

TABLE 30.—NEW ZEALAND

Product	Type of restriction
Nonagricultural quantitative restrictions: Most imports, including the following which have been subject of complaint by U.S. exporters: flavored drinking straws, pumps, industrial sewing machines, commercial refrigerators, textile products, photographic equipment, reel-bar side rakes, beer, musical instruments.	Import licensing; quotas.

TABLE 31.—BURMA

Product	Type of restriction
Nonagricultural quantitative restrictions: All imports.	Government monopoly of imports.
Valuation and taxes: All goods imported for sale..	Sales tax: (a) Luxury goods, 18.75 percent (b) standard goods, 12.50 percent; (c) privileged goods, 6.25 percent.
Other restrictions:	
Imports, general.....	Bilateral reparations agreement.
Industrial plants and related equipment.....	Bilateral loan agreement.
All products purchased for the public account..	Government procurement practices, short bid-deadlines.

TABLE 32.—CEYLON

Product	Type of restriction
Nonagricultural quantitative restrictions:	
All imports.....	Individual import licensing, exchange quota.
Nonessential items, including sunglasses, cigarette lighters, cigarette lighter flints, perfumery, bangles and beads, wallpaper, waste paper and oil paper, floor tiles, domestic ware, ballpoint pens, plastic sheets with floral designs, floor covering, chilled and frozen fruits, bicycle parts, electric lamps, photographic and cinematographic apparatus, watches and clocks, footwear, and automobiles.	Prohibition.
Textile products.....	Requirement that domestic product must be purchased in specified ratio to imported product.
Health, sanitary, and safety regulations:	
Cotton rugs, used clothing.....	Sanitary.
Drugs and pharmaceutical preparations.....	Health.

TABLE 32.—CEYLON—Continued

Product	Type of restriction
Other restrictions:	
Various items.....	Bilateral agreements.
Cereals, flour, pulses, sugar, fish, certain other foodstuffs, cement, textiles, newsprint, paper and paperboard, petroleum products, caustic soda, animal feedstuffs.	Government monopoly imports.

TABLE 33.—CYPRUS

Product	Type of restriction
Nonagricultural quantitative restrictions: Meat and poultry; certain dairy products; wheat and flour; fruits and vegetables, fresh or dried preserved; prepared animal foods; common soap and detergents; certain chemicals; wood creosote, pitch, and tar; wooden boxes and cases; builders' wood-work; cardboard and paper containers; certain textiles; iron wire, wire netting, and wire nails; portland cement; mosaic floor tiles; iron and steel buckets for household use; crown corks; steam generating boilers and engines; metal- and wood-working machinery; centrifugal pumps; papermill and pulpmill machinery and machinery for paper manufactures; printing machinery; textile machinery; industrial sewing machines; certain other nonelectrical machinery; electric amplifiers; wood furniture and fixtures; table, household, and decorative articles of plastics, except flooring tiles; artificial teeth.	Import licensing.

TABLE 34.—INDIA

Product	Type of restriction
Nonagricultural quantitative restrictions:	
All imports except Government orders, imports under open general license, and passenger baggage.	Import license, import fees, exchange control quotas.
Capital goods, heavy electrical plant, and machine tools valued at \$100,000 or more. ¹	Special licensing terms.
Valuation and taxes:	
Imports in general.	
Tobacco and tobacco products; salt; petroleum products; vegetable oils and fats; pigments, colors, paints, enamels, varnishes, flacks, and cellulose lacquers; soda ash; caustic soda; sodium silicate and glycerin; synthetic organic dyestuffs; organic luminophores; patent medicines; cosmetics and toilet preparations not containing alcohol or narcotics; nitric, hydrochloric, and sulfuric acids; compressed, liquefied, or solidified gases; soap; plastics; organic surface-acting agents; cellophane; tires and certain other rubber products; plywood and paperboard; paper; cotton twist, yarn, and thread; rayon and synthetic fibers and yarn; woolen yarn; cotton, woolen, silk, and synthetic fabrics; jute manufactures; cement; glass and glassware; asbestos cement products; silver; iron in crude form; steel ingots; copper and copper alloys; iron and steel products; zinc; aluminum and products; lead; tin plate and tinne sheets; internal combustion engines; refrigerating equipment; electric motors; batteries; lighting bulbs and tubes; electric fans; wireless receiving sets; motor vehicles; cycles and parts; footwear; cinematograph films; record players, matches; and mechanical lighters.	Excise tax.
Health, sanitary, and safety restrictions: Pharmaceuticals, medicines.	Health regulations.
Other restrictions:	
Artificial silk yarn and thread, caustic soda, soda ash, newsprint, cement, fertilizer, petroleum products, other items as might be determined from time to time such as capital goods and industrial raw materials.	State trading.
Products purchased for public account.....	Government procurement practices:
	(a) Price differential.
	(b) Erratic bidding practices.
Engineering goods; chemicals, drugs, and pharmaceuticals; tires and tubes; paper products; leather and leather goods; plastics; fish and fish products; sports goods; woolen carpets and rugs; woolen textiles and hosiery, and mixed fabrics and ready-made garments thereof; unmanufactured tobacco and cigarettes; processed foods; cotton textiles and apparel; cashew kernels; gem and jewelry items; cinematograph films.	Export subsidies:
	(a) Import entitlements.
	(b) 25 percent rebate on domestic rail charges.
Imports in general.	
Motion picture films.....	Bilateral agreements.
Ammonium nitrate fertilizer.....	Restriction on transfer of film earnings.
Engineering goods, iron and steel, china clay, plywood products, absorbent cotton, woolen carpets, cotton textiles.	Dock unloading restrictions.
Flameproof mining machinery.....	Cash subsidies.
	Specifications.

¹ Many of these items are imported under tied procurement aid agreements with the United States and other foreign countries. Considerable amounts of U.S. exports of these items are supplied under AID loans.

TABLE 35.—ISRAEL

Product	Type of restriction
Nonagricultural quantitative restrictions: Imports in general.	Import licensing.
Valuation and taxes:	
Most imported goods.	Purchase tax: 5 percent to 100 percent; few items over 100 percent.
	Import surcharge.
Numerous items, including many foodstuffs; edible oils and fats; alcoholic beverages; tobacco; crude petroleum; fuel oils and gases; certain chemicals and plastics; hides, skins, and leather; certain wood products; certain paper products; many textile products; certain glass products; a few products of base metals; electric refrigerators; transformers up to 2,500 V.A.; certain electric apparatus; musical instruments.	
Health, sanitary and safety restrictions: Medicines and pharmaceutical preparations; cosmetics.	Health restrictions.
Other restrictions: Motion picture films.	(a) Subsidy.

TABLE 36.—KUWAIT

Product	Type of restriction
Nonagricultural quantitative restrictions: Firearms, munitions, poisons, pork and alcoholic beverages.	Import licensing.
Other restrictions: All imports.	Arab boycott of Israel.
	Agency requirements.

TABLE 37.—PAKISTAN

Product	Type of restriction
Nonagricultural quantitative restrictions: All commercial imports except a few items on free list (composition of free list varies in successive licensing policies) and imports by government departments.	Import and exchange licensing.
Valuation and taxes:	
Most products imported for sale.	Sales tax—15 percent in most instances.
All imports except for exempted items of machinery and parts, components and apparatus for use with machinery.	Customs surcharge—25 percent of customs duty.
Health, sanitary and safety restrictions: Pharmaceutical preparations, medicines.	Health regulation.
Other restrictions:	
Motion picture films.	(a) Remittance restriction.
	(b) Import restriction.
Automobiles.	Value imitation.

TABLE 38.—TURKEY

Product	Type of restriction
Nonagricultural quantitative restrictions:	
All permissible imports.	Import licensing.
Some chemicals, paints, and pharmaceuticals; explosives; some photographic equipment; plastics and certain rubber goods; some wood, paper, and textile products; some glass products and most manufactures of copper, aluminum, and zinc; certain tools; some tractors and trucks, trailers, and motorcycles; planes for spraying; clocks and watches; musical instruments; tape recorders and tape; certain scientific and technical instruments; many types of industrial, agricultural, and electrical machinery and apparatus; office machines, certain iron and steel products; certain, vegetable oils; asbestos; and certain petroleum products.	Quotas.
Valuation and taxes:	
All imports.	Surtax, 15 percent of the assessed duty.
All goods imported by sea.	Port tax, 5 percent of cost, insurance, and freight plus duty, surtax, and customs clearance costs.
All imports.	Stamp tax, 10 percent of cost, insurance, and freight value.
Most imports.	Production tax ranging from 10 to 75 percent of sum of cost, insurance, and freight value, customs duty, customs surtax, port tax, and customs clearing expenses.
All imports.	Consular invoice fee ranging from 0.3 to 0.5 percent of free on board value.
Motion picture films.	Film tax:
	(a) Foreign films, 70 percent.
	(b) Domestic films, 25 percent.
Methyl alcohol.	Monopoly tax.
Automobiles.	Surtax.
Health, sanitary, and safety restrictions: Medicines, pharmaceuticals; baby foods; medical equipment; some chemicals, insecticides, weed killers; magazines, books, newspapers.	Special administrative controls requiring approval of certain Government agencies for importation.
Other restrictions:	
Tobacco and tobacco products; cigarette paper; various alcoholic beverages.	State trading.
All imports.	Advance deposit.
Do.	Guarantee deposit.

TABLE 39.—CAMEROON

Product	Type of restriction
Nonagricultural quantitative restrictions: All imports.	Import licensing and exchange quotas.
Valuation and taxes:	
All dutiable imports.	Turnover tax 10 percent.
Many items.	Additional tax 5 to 35 percent.
Other restrictions:	
Various items.	Bilateral trade agreements.
All imports.	Discriminatory tariffs.

TABLE 40.—CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Product	Type of restriction
Nonagricultural quantitative restrictions: All imports.	Import licensing and exchange quotas.
Valuation and taxes:	
All dutiable imports.	Turnover tax, 10 percent.
Selected items.	Additional tax: 5 to 25 percent.
Other restrictions: All imports.	Discriminatory tariff.

TABLE 41.—CHAD

Product	Type of restriction
Nonagricultural quantitative restrictions: All imports.	Import licensing and exchange quotas.
Valuation and taxes:	
All imports.	Turnover tax—10 percent.
Selected items.	Additional tax 5 percent to 45 percent.
Other restrictions: All imports.	Discriminatory tariff.

TABLE 42.—CONGO (BRAZZAVILLE)

Product	Type of restriction
Nonagricultural quantitative restrictions: All imports.	Import license and exchange quota.
Valuation and taxes:	
All imports.	Turnover tax—10 percent.
Selected items.	Additional tax 5 percent to 15 percent.
Other restrictions: All imports.	Discriminatory tariff.

TABLE 43.—GABON

Product	Type of restriction
Nonagricultural quantitative restrictions: All imports.	Import licensing and exchange quota.
Valuation and taxes: All imports.	Turnover tax—10 percent.
Other restrictions: All imports.	Discriminatory tariff.

TABLE 44.—GHANA

Product	Type of restriction
Nonagricultural quantitative restrictions: Most imports.	Import licensing.
Valuation and taxes:	
Vehicles.	Purchase tax 5 to 100 percent.
Most imports.	Sales tax, 11½ percent.
Selected items.	Excise tax, 2½ to 75 percent ad valorem.

TABLE 45.—KENYA, TANZANIA, AND UGANDA

Product	Type of restriction
Nonagricultural quantitative restrictions:	
Certain dairy products, cereals, fruits, and vegetables, foodstuffs, fertilizers, animal and vegetable oils, bags and sacks, cement, jewelry, matches, and gold.	Import licensing.
Although Kenya, Tanzania, and Uganda are separate political areas, they have a common customs union. All goods other than those listed enter under open general license, except those which are excluded, such as counterfeit money, obscene literature, etc.	

TABLE 46.—MALAWI

Product	Type of restriction
Nonagricultural quantitative restrictions: Some textile products; secondhand clothing; jute bags; gold; matches; certain knives; secondhand accounting machines; radioactive elements; explosives; arms and ammunition; game traps; trophies.	Import licensing.
Valuation and taxes: Cigarettes, alcohol and alcoholic beverages, soaps and soap substitutes.	Excise tax.

TABLE 47.—NIGERIA

Product	Type of restriction
Nonagricultural quantitative restrictions: Cotton and cotton byproducts, soybeans, articles manufactured of gold, coal, petroleum products, second-hand clothing, and cement.	Import licensing.
Health, sanitary, and safety regulations: Pharmaceuticals.	Discriminatory classification.

TABLE 48.—SIERRA LEONE

Product	Type of restriction
Nonagricultural quantitative restrictions: Certain foodstuffs, medicinal and pharmaceutical products, firearms, ammunition, and explosives, some jewelry and products similar to those produced locally.	Import licensing.

TABLE 49.—REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

Product	Type of restriction
Nonagricultural quantitative restrictions: Most imports.	Import licensing.
Other restrictions: Motion picture films.	Domestic subsidy.

TREASURY REFORM OF INDUSTRIAL REVENUE BOND REGULATIONS

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, on November 8, 1967, I introduced a bill which would end the tax-exempt status of interest paid on industrial development bonds. In the accompanying statement I pointed out the great difficulty in understanding how under the language of the Internal Revenue Code these bonds could be regarded as "obligations" of State and local governments for Federal tax purposes and therefore tax exempt.

An examination of the terms and conditions of a typical industrial development bond makes it clear that they are really corporate bonds. The party obligated to make payments of interest and principal called for by the bonds is the private corporation on whose behalf the bond was issued. In most cases these bonds are revenue bonds; that is, the only thing the governmental unit involved obligates itself to do is to act as a conduit: collecting money from the private corporation and paying it over to the bond buyers. In these cases the governmental unit assumes no obligation, direct or indirect, for payment of either principal or interest on the bonds. Even when so-called general obligation bonds are used the contracts make it clear that the governmental unit is merely a surety or guarantor of the private corporation's interest payment and that the corporation involved is the party primarily obligated to pay the interest and principal on the bonds. Whether the document obligating the corporation is called a lease, conditional sale contract, or loan seem irrelevant, the essential fact remains that it is the private corporation being benefited by the bonds that undertakes the primary obligation to provide for the payment of the bonds.

The Treasury Department, in reporting on the bill introduced last year, took note of my statement questioning the validity of their outstanding rulings.

They indicated that this question was "under study." The Treasury Department announced yesterday that proposed regulations would be coming out around March 15 holding that interest on these "corporate tax exempts" will no longer be considered exempt under existing law.

In view of the crisis these bonds have been causing in the municipal bond market the Treasury Department had an obligation to reverse its past position. I only wish that they had acted earlier so that States and local governments would not have had to bear the added cost in borrowing for their legitimate governmental purposes that were imposed by virtue of the existence of these corporate tax exempts in the market. Connecticut does not authorize industrial development bonds. However, I understand that the very existence of these bonds on the market increased the borrowing costs of Connecticut communities by an estimated one-fourth to one-half of 1 percent last year. This means that on the \$314 million in bonds issued last year for schools, sewers, and other governmental purposes Connecticut taxpayers became obligated to pay over the life of the bonds between \$12 to \$24 million in added interest merely because these "corporate tax exempts" were being issued. That means higher local taxes for Connecticut residents, so I am glad to see this much-needed tax reform.

The Securities and Exchange Commission, the Federal agency most experienced in dealing with corporate financial areas, shares my understanding of the true nature of these bonds. On February 1, 1968, the SEC announced a proposed regulation which would hold that these bonds are not entitled to the exemption from registration accorded municipal obligations and would thus require the private corporations involved in such bond issues to register their obligations with the SEC. The SEC explained:

An industrial development bond represents "(1) an obligation on the part of a government or its instrumentality to perform certain acts, usually to collect rental under

TABLE 50.—SOUTHERN RHODESIA

Product	Type of restriction
Nonagricultural quantitative restrictions: Many commodities of a luxury nature or if similarly produced in Southern Rhodesia.	Import licensing.

TABLE 51.—UPPER VOLTA

Product	Type of restriction
Nonagricultural quantitative restrictions: All imports.	Import and exchange licenses.
Valuation and taxes: All imports.	Standard tax, 25 percent. Temporary development tax, 10 percent. Statistical tax, 1 percent.
Health, sanitary, and safety restrictions: Medicaments.	Discriminatory classification.

TABLE 52.—ZAMBIA

Product	Type of restriction
Nonagricultural quantitative restrictions: Most goods.	Import licensing.

the lease and use it to discharge interest, sinking fund, and other monetary obligations contained in the instrument; and (2) an interest in the obligation of the private company to make payments under the lease in order to provide funds for payment by the governmental instrumentality in whose name the bond is issued of principal and interest on the bond."

The SEC's action and the Treasury's action are correct. These bonds simply are not State and local bonds; they are private corporate obligations that must be treated the same as other corporate obligations under both the securities law and the tax law.

While I thus applaud the action of these agencies I nevertheless feel that it would be appropriate to continue to press for legislation on this subject.

COPPER RIVALS GAIN

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, the 8-month copper strike, that is now the subject of discussion at the White House between management and union representatives, will have far-reaching consequences that I think both parties should be aware of.

Competitors in both production and market areas are not standing still in this long period of enforced idleness. Markets where once copper was king are now being supplanted. Perhaps these inroads will never be erased. If so, this will cause continued economic dislocation in my own State as well as in the other Western copper-producing States.

These market forces are going on in the interim that the dispute has created; and besides their long-term effect, the copper industry—and ultimately the copper consumer, the housewife, the home-buyer, the purchasers of air conditioners or motors—will be faced with higher prices resulting from higher wage costs forced by the strike.

One of the major producers says, in an article published in Chemical and Engineering News, that wage costs are likely to be increased by 11 percent if union demands are met.

Mr. President, this is almost double the settlements made in other industries and very much in excess of reported productivity gains. Thus, the net effect will certainly be inflationary and will undoubtedly make copper's position even more precarious in certain major markets.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STRIKE BRIGHTENS CHARMS OF COPPER'S RIVALS: ALUMINUM AND PLASTICS SEIZE CHANCE TO MAKE FURTHER INROADS IN COPPER MARKETS

As the copper strike marches toward the end of its eighth month, with intractable union confronting intransigent industry, competitive materials such as aluminum and plastics are viewing it as an opportunity to open up some potentially staggering tonnage markets. Specific examples of inroads that have already been made as a direct result of the strike can't be pinpointed; eight months don't make or break a market. But long-term pressures are at work as well as the strike. Aluminum and plastics producers tell C&EN they expect to see in the aftermath of the strike:

A gradual increase in penetration of substitutes into almost all major copper markets, with plastic pipe and aluminum wiring the big gainers.

Further diversification by copper tubing and cast iron fabricators into plastic pipe production facilities.

Heightened interest in their products on the part of potential customers.

At press time, the strike had provoked calls for the President to use the Taft-Hartley Act's provision for an 80-day cooling-off period by asking for a back-to-work injunction. Dockworkers were threatening to refuse to unload copper imports on Gulf and East Coast ports. And the Commerce Department had ordered a freeze on shipments of refined copper to all but defense contractors. The economic impact of the strike is felt in a worsening of the nation's balance of trade of about \$60 million a month, the loss of wages for about 50,000 workers idled by the strike, skyrocketing prices for copper, and a sharp drop in earnings in the last half of 1967 for the nation's copper mining and smelting companies.

But the strike's other drama, unfolding in the background, may be the permanent loss of copper markets. Predictions in this area are clouded because copper is still plentiful. As one bewildered observer puts it, "There is a seemingly inexhaustible supply." As long as copper is available, the strike is just an added problem to an industry whose reputation for stability in labor relations, supplies, and prices was already badly tarnished.

"The prolonged strike has certainly accelerated the replacement of copper by aluminum in electrical markets," points out William S. Ginn, vice president, electrical division, Reynolds Metals. Uniroyal's Rom Rhone, vice chairman of the ABS Council (a unit of the Society of the Plastics Industry), says that the strike has triggered five or six price increases in copper tubing since June with the result that what was only an "incentive" to substitute ABS for copper tubing in residential drainage systems has now become "a compelling necessity."

The electrical and electronic industry is the largest consumer of copper. Of the total of 7.1 billion pounds of copper and copper alloys consumed in the U.S. in 1966, electrical and electronic uses accounted for 1.9 billion pounds. Other major markets for copper and their 1966 uses of it are: building construction with 1.6 billion pounds, consumer and

general products with 1.5 billion pounds, industrial machinery equipment with 1.3 billion pounds, and transportation with 904 million pounds.

Aluminum companies have worked diligently to wrest business away from copper. Their present strategy is to encroach wherever possible on markets where copper's superior heat and electrical conductivity had made it heretofore secure. Success has almost been attained in some key automobile and electrical cable uses.

An immediate target for takeover by aluminum is the automobile battery cable. Battery jumper cables for garages are now being made from stranded and solid aluminum cable. Aluminum battery cables have a good chance to supplant copper in some 1969 production models.

The number of factory-installed air conditioners in automobiles has doubled every three years since 1958. Its weight advantage enabled aluminum to displace copper from this market even before the strike. Reynolds estimates that 35 million pounds of aluminum went to tubes and sheet in auto air conditioners in the 1967-68 model year and predicts that by 1970 this use will require about 55 million pounds of aluminum.

Aluminum producers also expect to capture the window and central air conditioner market for aluminum coils and sheet. These units now use about 20 pounds of copper for every \$100 worth of finished product and the high world copper price (61 cents a pound vs. 36 to 38 cents per pound before the strike) enhances Aluminum's chances. Within five years, 30 to 50% of all window air conditioning units and 50 to 75% of package or central installations will utilize aluminum tubing in both evaporator and condenser coils, according to Alcoa vice president James A. McGowan.

The aluminum automobile radiator is still some time in the future. Leaks on pilot production runs of aluminum units were an initial obstacle. An additional difficulty blocking acceptance of the aluminum radiator is the problem of garage repairs. Epoxy, other adhesives, and soldering techniques have been developed and primary producers say that problem has now been solved.

Alcoa estimates that the use of aluminum in all types of electrical cable should grow from 1.26 billion pounds in 1967 to 1.4 billion pounds this year, an 11% increase. Again, it is difficult to say how much of this increase can be attributed to the strike. Steel-reinforced aluminum cable and all-aluminum cable now have almost 100% of the overhead high-voltage transmission business. Aluminum firms are now concentrating on replacing copper in utility service lines to homes and industrial users.

Millions of miles of telephone cable are made of copper. The Bell System alone uses about 400 million pounds of copper annually. About half of it goes to produce exchange area telephone cable, which is used in relatively short runs. Western Electric Co. now produces about 100 billion feet of plastic-insulated copper wire annually.

Bell Labs and Western Electric Co., with support from American Telephone & Telegraph, began a development project in the spring of 1965 to find an alternate for copper in exchange area cable. Four field tests using aluminum cable have been started and the work so far indicates that aluminum may, "in the near future be useable as a partial replacement for copper. This could be vital if the supply of copper were reduced for an extended time, or if the price of copper should continue to rise," said F. W. Horn and W. E. Bleinberger in the November *Bell Laboratories Record*. The primary disadvantages of aluminum telephone cable are that it corrodes and loses strength when it is exposed to moisture under conditions that exclude air.

Drain, waste, and vent (DWV) piping is

another domain of copper that is vulnerable to attack from plastics. Copper first entered the DWV market in 1955. Shipments of copper tubing for DWV use reached a peak of 85 million pounds in 1965, dropping to about 55 million pounds in 1966 and even less last year. Plastic pipe producers reason that they can emulate copper's success by cracking the building codes of local, state, and federal agencies. Acrylonitrile-butadienestyrene (ABS) pipe is primarily used in DWV piping while polyvinyl chloride and polyethylene use centers on service lines where pressure is encountered. Rom Rhone of Uniroyal's chemical division says he expects piping use of ABS resin to increase 25%, from 28 million pounds in 1967 to 35 million pounds in 1968, as a result of a continued good rate of building code penetration and the copper strike. ABS drain, waste, and vent pipe is now acceptable in the plumbing regulations of 13 states. Local code approvals for ABS pipe have been secured in 376 communities in 33 states.

To gain the DWV market, plastics have to supplant both cast iron pipe and copper tubing. Cost is a big factor, but high copper prices won't necessarily translate into sales gains for plastic pipe because cast iron is readily available. For this reason, plastic pipe advocates such as Bob Rosel, marketing manager for the Yardley pipe and fitting division of Celanese Plastics Co., discount the effect of short-term price swings in copper tubing. "We have to obtain and hold markets on the merits of our products," he explains. The cost of copper tubing in residential drainage systems now stands at more than three times the cost of ABS. On a per-foot basis, 3-inch copper DWV tubing costs \$1.95 compared to 57 cents for the ABS pipe of comparable diameter.

The copper strike is bound to spur the diversification of copper and cast iron pipe and fitting producers into plastic pipe production facilities. The copper tubing and fitting industry is already represented in plastic DWV by Triangle Conduit & Cable, Nibco, Mueller Brass, and American Brass & Iron Foundry. National Distillers has a foot in both camps through its subsidiaries Bridgeport Brass and Evanite Plastic Co. The roster of cast iron companies now producing plastic DWV pipe includes U.S. Pipe & Foundry, James B. Clow & Sons, Glamorgan Pipe & Foundry and Charlotte Pipe and Foundry.

The move into plastic pipe by metal pipe producers is a big step for these firms because it marks a departure from the security of a high-investment, high-profit-margin business to an operation characterized by low investment, low margins, but stable prices and a continuous supply of raw materials.

Estimates of the dislocation caused by the strike must take into account the fact that copper is not critically short. Imports of refined metal have increased from the more normal \$18 million a month to about \$60 million a month. Increased scrap recovery, inventory liquidations, and sales from the U.S. stockpile over the past four years of apparent copper shortage have prevented a crisis from developing. The business slowdown in western Europe made it possible for U.S. consumers to buy copper contracts that European firms owned but no longer needed. Inventories of refined copper, which at mid-year stood at an all-time high of 290,000 tons, were 185,000 tons by year end, according to Commerce Department estimates.

ECONOMIC DEMANDS

One issue overshadows all others in the strike. It is the demand for companywide bargaining. About 80% of the 50,000 workers affected by the strike are represented by the United Steelworkers of America. Other unions have combined with the USW to form a single bargaining unit. The unions do not insist on a single master contract but do demand

common contract expiration dates with some common features relating to fringe benefits, pension rights, and similar economic increases common to all contracts. Nor are the unions asking for uniform wage scales for this year, although their long-range plans probably include this feature.

Frank R. Milliken, president of Kennecott Copper, says, "the unions' economic demands would raise our labor costs 11% a year, which is about double the percentage increase in settlements made in any other major industry, and far in excess of gains in labor productivity." He adds, "to accede to the unions' economic demands would impair our ability to remain competitive with low cost foreign producers and with other materials used as substitutes for copper."

Copper Range Co., which has acceded to union demands at its White Pine, Mich., mine, figures that increases in wages and benefits will total 96 cents an hour over the 42-month life of the contract, about \$13 million in increased labor costs.

REFINED COPPER IMPORTS CLIMBING EACH MONTH

[In thousands of short tons]

	Imports	
	1966	1967
January.....	12	20
February.....	10	20
March.....	13	13
April.....	10	21
May.....	13	19
June.....	7	23
July.....	10	18
August.....	7	18
September.....	9	27
October.....	18	45
November.....	28	58
December.....	24	61
Totals.....	161	343

1 C. & E.N. estimate.

Source: Bureau of Mines.

THE NATIONAL GRADUATE UNIVERSITY

Mr. MORSE, Mr. President, in these times of crisis in our cities, with air and water pollution, civil disobedience, and housing and transportation difficulties, special attention must be focused on the need for high-level training of leaders in the professions who will seek better solutions to these problems.

It is encouraging, therefore, to learn that an institution has been established to provide the special education and research required by modern society. I am referring to National Graduate University to be built on a beautiful 900-acre site in Potomac, Md., just 12 miles from this Chamber. An innovative curriculum is being developed for master's and doctorate degrees as well as postdoctorate education.

Colleges being planned at National Graduate University reflect the high degree of understanding and concern its leaders have for current and future needs of our country and the world. Most significantly, a graduate college of resources management is the first degree program to be inaugurated. Developmental planning, environmental science, and human services are three other colleges which will be producing the scientists and administrators so necessary in our model cities programs and in our efforts to enable the poverty stricken and low income to become economically independent and productive members of our Nation.

In addition to the colleges at National Graduate University, an international conference center is planned, with activities available for local, national, and international meetings of persons concerned with problems faced by peoples around the world. Such a center would become a focal point for educators, scientists, engineers, management specialists, diplomats, and many others in the public and private spheres. In its organizational procedures, types of facilities provided, and architecture, this center will be designed to carry out the philosophy of National Graduate University which is to make learning as well as achievement of understanding among people an efficient and pleasant process.

I congratulate Dr. Melville Bell Grosvenor, chairman of the board of governors of National Graduate University; Dr. Walter E. Boek, its president, and other board members; Mr. Mortimer B. Doyle, the Honorable Louise Gore, Tilford A. Jones, Esq., Mrs. John R. Johnston, and Mr. Frederick Krug for their foresight and devotion to public service in developing this institution which promises so much for the future of mankind.

HARVARD PROFESSOR JUST BACK FROM VIETNAM ASSESSES TET OFFENSIVE

Mr. HARTKE, Mr. President, visiting Washington last week was a scientifically trained American civilian just back from Vietnam whose return was delayed more than a week when he was caught as a bystander in the Vietcong Tet offensive. Dr. Everett I. Mendelsohn is associate professor of the history of science at Harvard University, whose well-known student publication, the Harvard Crimson, on Saturday, February 24, published a tape-recorded interview detailing his assessment of his Southeast Asia trip.

Dr. Mendelsohn, who went under Quaker auspices, includes in his remarks a conversation with a National Liberation Front high official in Phnom Penh, Cambodia; his visit to a civilian provincial hospital in Quang Ngai, where of more than 70 civilians in the burn ward he found that some 40 of them had burns traceable to napalm; conversations with civilian leaders not in the Government, including Tich Tri Quang and others who have been since arrested; and his conclusion that—

The government of President Thieu and Marshal Ky is very near collapse.

In a luncheon discussion with a number of congressional staff people he noted, in a comment not included in the Harvard Crimson, that his first knowledge of the assault came at 3 a.m., when he found himself on the floor of his hotel room, thrown out of bed by the concussion of a mortar round striking the building next door. He also observed the bombing of residential portions of the Saigon outskirts, talked with refugees both before and afterward, and found a growing frustration both with their own and with our Government which has caused the vast destruction which has made another 300,000 persons homeless in recent weeks.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Harvard Crimson inter-

view with Professor Mendelsohn be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the interview was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN INTERVIEW WITH EVERETT I. MENDELSON: FRESH FROM A TRIP TO VIETNAM, PROFESSOR MENDELSON GIVES A GLOOMY ASSESSMENT OF THE WAR'S PROGRESS

(NOTE.—Everett I. Mendelsohn, associate professor of History of Science, recently returned from a Southeast Asian tour which took him to South Vietnam, Thailand and Cambodia.)

(Under the sponsorship of the American Friends Service Committee, a Quaker service organization, Mendelsohn visited Quaker projects and sought to assess the possibility of a peaceful solution to the Vietnamese conflict through conversations with Vietnamese civilians. In Cambodia he met with a high representative of the National Liberation Front.)

(His departure from South Vietnam was delayed ten days by the Viet Cong urban offensive.)

(Mendelsohn questions the rosy picture of military progress presented by the United States government, and says the Thieu-Ky regime may be nearing collapse.)

(He believes the Viet Cong offensive, and the unlimited character of our response to it, have limited the future options open to us in South Vietnam. He fears that we will face continued military setbacks until we either withdraw, or resort to nuclear weapons.)

(The following remarks are taken from an interview which Parker Donnam had with Professor Mendelsohn on Thursday, Feb. 22.)

Question. What effect did this trip have on your opinion of the war?

Answer. I expect the trip didn't radically change my views of the war, it did two other things though. One: it personalized them. I think it's hard even with the greatest imagination to recognize what happens to specific people in specific parts of a country, without seeing them. Seeing the war at first hand, meeting people who had been involved in it, people who have suffered from it, meeting people who have opposed it on the scene, gave me a series of new insights.

The other set of changes that I came away with, also had to do with getting some things at first hand. In Phnom Penh, Cambodia, I met with a high official of the National Liberation Front. He is a well educated man, not an unattractive man, obviously quite intelligent, I gather that he's on the Central Committee of the National Liberation Front.

Even having been an opponent of the war, but having read the U.S. press primarily, and in detail, it was hard to believe anything but that the enormous firepower and large scale military operations the U.S. was waging was indeed winning the war. Perhaps it could never really become militarily victorious. It seemed from everything I'd been able to read that we were winning military victories.

Mr. Y [we shall call him] had quite a different view. So far as I could tell, in all honesty, he believed that the National Liberation Front was winning. We pressed him on this in a number of ways. We asked him about the impact of the firepower on the Vietnamese and he said, yes when it comes to bombing a village or a town, the enormous firepower from the air takes its toll. Primarily, he pointed out, on civilians, and in person I was able to see this on the ground later on. He said, however, that when it comes to controlling the countryside, this can be done only by infantry troops with rifles going out and winning an area and then controlling it and keeping it. And he said that the enormous gains of the firepower were lost in this kind of combat. He pointed out that the rifle of the N.L.F. soldier was just as effective as the rifle of the American. Even more, he pointed out that the N.L.F. soldier generally knew the terrain he was

fighting in; it was friendly to him, whereas it was foreign to the American soldier.

He pointed out one other thing. He said the very history of the war suggests that the United States is not winning, indeed, might well be losing. He pointed out that the fighting takes place during the dry season, the winter months for us, November through April. For the rest of the year, he said everyone just sits tight and holds on to what they have and hopes not to be washed away by the flood.

He said in the winter of 1965-66, the first year of major escalation, the United States had some 200,000 ground troops in Vietnam. He said during that winter the U.S. attempted to launch offensive actions in all four areas, from the I Corps in the North down to the Delta. He said that they weren't really effective in too many of them, but they were on the offensive in all four.

The next year, the winter of 1966-67, during the dry season the U.S. had some 400,000 troops on the ground, yet was able to launch an offensive action in only the I Corps area. In the other three areas they were on the defensive, or holding tight. He said that in the winter of 1967-68, the United States forces with over 500,000 men on the ground, were unable to launch an offensive in any single of the four corps areas. Indeed, he said, to the contrary his own forces, stronger than they had been before, were able to be effective in all of the areas.

This, mind you, was two weeks before I got to Saigon, some two weeks before their attacks on all the cities.

Question. How serious is the refugee problem?

Answer. Vietnam has probably suffered most through its civilian population. At the moment it is estimated that something close to one quarter of the total population are refugees. This number has probably gone up in recent weeks, after the attacks. The problem of refugees is an enormous one because most of the refugees come from the farm. They are peasants who made their living by tilling the land. What they've done was to flee to the cities, where they live in squatters villages surrounding the cities. Many of them in squalor, even the best of them providing nothing but a single room in a mud walled hut, the best perhaps with tin roofs. The others are in much worse shape. There is very little in the way of sanitary facilities, and there is no room whatsoever for these men to provide the livelihood the one way they know how, through raising the food which they would eat.

A visit to the refugee camps, and we visited them around Saigon, in Hue, most intensively in the city of Quang Ngai, a visit to these camps brought out one thing which I had not quite been prepared for. As you walked through the camp, looking around, smiling at people, greeting people, children run around your legs as children will anywhere in the world, having great fun. Even the women might smile back when you greet them. However, from the men, regardless what their age was, we got a very sullen stare in response.

In talking to the refugees, the answer was found very simply. They'd been driven from their homes, and they'd most often been driven out by airplanes which came and strafed and bombed their villages, and they'd fled to the cities. They'd lost their means of livelihood. In a sense they'd almost lost their manhood. Their indignation at the government of South Vietnam and at the Americans was very pointed and direct. They pointed the finger at us as having driven them from their land.

Question. How adequate were facilities for civilian wounded?

Answer. When we turn to the question of wounded, again the civilians seem to suffer most. This comes about really through the process that has made the refugees. Something close to two thirds of the land area

of South Vietnam is today declared a free fire zone. This means that anything in that area can be bombed, can be machine gunned, at the will of the spotters flying over in planes.

What was interesting to recognize, though, is that these free fire zones started just a few kilometers down the road from the major cities. The free fire zone outside Quang Ngai was just eight or ten kilometers from the city center. What this meant is that peasants working out in the field were regularly subjected to firing, to bombing, to harassment. All night long as we lay in our beds at Quang Ngai, we could hear the mortars and artillery and the helicopters raining down the terror on different parts of the countryside. And in the morning the results were quite clear. The litters carrying people in from the countryside with the gaping holes in their bodies, the wounded limbs, and the broken bones.

We visited the hospital at Quang Ngai and went through it in some detail with a doctor working with the Quaker unit. There was a standard medical ward which perhaps had an increase in the standard diseases of the area, malaria, diphtheria, cholera, plague had broken out in the region. And the other things that you are wont to find in this part of the world. But when we went beyond the medical ward into the severe injury ward, you saw the full horror of the war itself.

The hospital that we visited had first been built by the French, and it was a small hospital. During the last four years it has been enlarged to a hospital of some four hundred beds. In the week just prior to our visit the daily patient population of the hospital was over 750, meaning that there were two patients to many beds. The hospital itself, judged to be one of the best of the province hospitals in South Vietnam, had very little in the way of sanitary facilities. Walking through it, one had to take care to avoid stepping in human defecation. There were no screens in the windows, and open wounds were festering with maggots in them.

The most common operation carried out in South Vietnam today is amputation. The difficulty, however, is that the amputations are not always good. The sanitary facilities are not generally good enough and there is a lack of antiseptic procedures. What this means is that often a leg must be amputated two or three times before the amputation heals successfully.

There has been a lot of controversy as to whether napalm victims are to be found in Vietnam. As I recall, Dr. Howard Rusk, the New York Times medical correspondent found only six or seven in the whole of Vietnam. I often wonder, having visited the hospital at Quang Ngai, just where he had his eyes as he walked through this hospital. There were over seventy people in the burn ward at Quang Ngai when we visited there. Some forty of them had burns traceable to napalm.

The record was always the same in the hospital wards as to how these people were injured, whether the broken bones or the burns. In nine out of ten cases they were tending their animals, they were cultivating the fields, they were asleep in their huts, when things came from the air. Bombers or helicopters came over, losing rockets, machine guns, or bombs. They knew that the only people in the country who were using bombers and planes were their own government and the United States.

Every now and then, one in ten or so of the injuries as we looked over the hospital's records, were recorded as coming from ground fire. Here it is impossible to tell whether the ground fire was Viet Cong or that of the ARVN or American troops.

Question. Did you speak with civilians who oppose the war?

Answer. In talking to one group of South Vietnamese businessmen, lawyers, professionals, men who were parts of former gov-

ernments, we began asking them about how the prospect of reaching agreements with the National Liberation Front struck them. Was it possible? What might come from it? The response of one man was typical. He pointed out that the men of the National Liberation Front and in the government of North Vietnam were people he'd known. They were not just faceless opponents. These were men who had lived down the street from him when he was a young man. One of the leaders of the National Liberation Front had been to college with him in Paris. Another had been married to a distant cousin. Another had been in a law office of his. Some of these men he trusted; some of them he distrusted. Some of them he had liked; some of them he had disliked.

He said that there was some real reason to expect that a civilian government in South Vietnam, with the burden of a military war and leadership lifted from it, could well come to some sort of agreement with the National Liberation Front. I asked him and pressed him about what would happen after an agreement in the South. Unification, he felt, would ultimately come. After all Vietnam was one country; Vietnamese were fundamentally one people.

This man felt that what you would have is a socialization of the South and a liberalizing of the North. He felt there would be this interaction.

He was wealthy, he was a part of the mandarin, he was French educated, he was part of a former government, and yet for him this was a chance which he saw very well worth taking.

All right. If the cream of Vietnamese civilian leadership is willing to take this chance, if their major message—and he made it very clear that the message he wanted me and others to bring back to America was that the war had to be stopped and the U.S. had to get out and that Vietnam had to be turned back to civilian rule to work out their problems—if he's willing to take all these risks we should be willing to go with him.

They put it very bluntly. It's hard to know whether to believe them or not. They said they doubted that I would find a single major Vietnamese civilian individual who was not intimately tied to the current government, or enormously profiting from the war, who would not now be in favor of ending it. They said that nothing that any of them could conceive of happening in the future was worse than what was happening now under U.S. protection.

Question. Were the attacks a surprise?

Answer. I would say that they came as an absolute and complete surprise. The American military claim they knew about them. If they did know about them why they were thoroughly unprepared for them, and in a sense are culpable because of that. My guess is they really didn't know about them, or that they didn't believe the attacks could be as widespread, as well coordinated, as strong as they were. I mean I think the American military command in South Vietnam has suffered from what one newsman called an enormous dose of self-deceit. They had begun to believe their own statistics, which is terribly dangerous when the statistics are fundamentally in error. There was no sign that these attacks were expected. Americans were on leave all over the country. The South Vietnamese Army was spread out going home for Tet.

We drove down from Quang Ngai the day before Tet in a plane filled with men who had left the barracks in Quang Ngai going home to their families in Saigon. Well, if you are expecting a major attack within a day or two, you keep your army ready and you don't let them go home on leave. This just wasn't the case. The guard at the U.S. Embassy was lighter that night than it had been for months. The gate of the U.S. Embassy was standing open. You don't have all these things open if you expect an attack.

There was a lot of stew in the days just after the attack. General Westmoreland got on the Armed Forces Vietnam network to tell us all that this was the greatest defeat that the enemy had ever suffered. Ambassador Bunker got on to tell us that American forces and their gallant allies were having their greatest victory. They even had a brief dub-in from President Johnson in Washington telling us that this was a great defeat for the Viet Cong and a victory for America and South Vietnam. And that this was an act of last desperation on the part of the Viet Cong.

One of the reporters in Saigon was so appalled at all this deceit that in the middle of all this he filed a report to his newspaper with the lead, "The Viet Cong, in an act of desperation, today took over most of South Vietnam." This is about the way it looked to those of us who were there.

Question. What effect did the raids have?

Answer. It had several very dramatic effects.

It demonstrated to every Vietnamese citizen, that the government of South Vietnam and the enormous military power of the United States, were unable to provide them with the one thing which they thought they could get, security in the cities. Every major city in South Vietnam was breached. Every major city was invaded and attacked, sometimes by small groups, sometimes by much larger ones. If you want to undercut the authority of the government, if you want to undercut confidence in it, this was done with real ferocity.

We know that the pacification program is now over. The villages have been lost completely. There's another set of secondary effects which have come which I think are perhaps of even longer range importance. And this was the inability of both the United States and the South Vietnamese to cope with the attacks. We watched the government of South Vietnam and the American military call in air strikes against their own cities and their own civilians. We watched the whole Eastern industrial suburbs of Saigon, Gia Dinh, burned out, sector after sector, for five days running. And the thousands—hundreds of thousands of refugees pouring out of the area. We watched the whole of the area just south of the Ton Son Nhut Airport being burned out segment after segment for four and five days running. When we left they were still bombing out sections of the Pho To around the race track. Read for that the area around Penway Park and the density of the population around it.

And we watched them burning out sections of Cholon, the Chinese section of the city, which to this day still has fighting going on in it. There are parts of it still being burned out. What you did was to create hundreds of thousands of new refugees. And the indignation here against a government calling air strikes on its own residential sections, its own cities and its own population, is something which the Vietnamese had emblazoned in their minds as they fled from their homes, many of them being killed, many others being wounded.

We visited a couple of the refugee camps in the days just after the initial fighting and the indignation was very high. They pointed the finger directly at the United States and the government of South Vietnam.

Question. Were civilians given any warning prior to these counter attacks?

Answer. In some places a loudspeaker would come over in a helicopter or sometimes they came up to a segment of a city and broadcast over bull horns that people were to leave their homes immediately because they were bombing an area. In other sectors no warning was given. Sometimes you had as much as a couple of hours; sometimes you had no warning whatsoever. Anything which

ran out of these areas of course was shot as being a suspected Viet Cong.

Question. How badly was Saigon disrupted?

Answer. There was this marvelous juxtaposition. The Armed Forces Vietnam Network, which has a news broadcast for five minutes every hour on the hour, would come on first with this bland statement by General Westmoreland about the victory we are winning and how Saigon has now been completely retaken and that there are just pockets of resistance left. And that would be followed at the end of the news by an important announcement to all American personnel: All American personnel are required to stay in their billets until further notice. There is a 24-hour curfew for all American personnel. Do not leave your billets except under armed escort.

Nine days after this, when I left, American personnel were only getting to work part of the day and were having to go in armed convoys. And half of the offices hadn't reopened yet. This huge war machine—you've got no idea how big it is until you see it—this huge war effort of civilian and military personnel in Saigon had ground to a halt for over a week.

Question. Was the kill ratio in these battles as great as the U.S. forces have claimed?

Answer. Most of the newsmen I talked to just laughed. The body count is given primarily by the South Vietnamese. If you compare the number of bodies supposedly counted to the number of weapons captured, the ratio was five, six, and even seven to one. The reporters told me to look at that figure because they said weapons are a good indication of how many soldiers you have killed.

There's little doubt that the Viet Cong did lose men in this attack. I saw dozens of Viet Cong dead in the city. The figures they were giving, however, I think were absolutely ludicrous, believed by no one on the scene.

Question. What is the significance of the arrests in South Vietnam in the last few days?

Answer. At the moment I know of four men who've been arrested although the teletype tells us that there probably have been upwards of thirty-five arrests. Among these four, we met and talked with two of them. Thich Tri Quang, the militant Buddhist leader, perhaps one of the most important of the Buddhist leaders in South Vietnam, has been arrested. We saw him just before the attacks; we saw one of his colleagues, Thich Tinh Minh, just after the attacks.

During the attacks themselves the South Vietnamese government announced that An Quang pagoda where Thich Tri Quang had been living just on the outskirts of Cholon was being used as a command post by the V.C. Thich Tinh Minh said it's absolutely absurd.

He said that what was happening was that the Thieu government was using this as an occasion to take revenge and create harassment for the Buddhists against whom they feel they have many scores to settle.

He said the An Quang pagoda was probably the place under greatest surveillance by the police, since they distrust it so. He said the Viet Cong would have been idiots to try to come near the place, and probably stayed very clear of it if they were going to try to get into the city secretly.

Thich Tri Quang, probably the single most influential Buddhist in the country and a major opponent of the current government is now jailed.

The two runners-up in the presidential campaign against Thieu, including the man who received the greatest number of votes in Saigon itself, Truong Dinh Do, have been arrested. As has the man who was behind him in the number of votes he received, Pham Khue Suu.

The fourth man who has been arrested, Au Truong Thanh, a former finance minis-

ter in the government of Premier Diem, a former finance minister again in the civilian government of Dr. Quaht, probably the single most respected non-government civilian leader in the country, a man who was barred from running for the presidency probably because of the fear that he would have been elected.

What seems to be happening is what Professor Galbraith predicted. The government of President Thieu and Marshal Ky is very near collapse. What they are doing is rounding up and threatening all the possible forces who can oppose them. They're making sure if they can that there will be no possible civilian government to follow them.

Now the embassy supposedly, according to the papers, has shown some disturbance. But let's be absolutely blunt and clear. The American forces in Vietnam can do what they want to do. And when they're interested enough in getting something done they get it done. If these men remain in prison or are shot, it's with the complicity of American forces.

Question. What is the outlook now in South Vietnam?

Answer. A few weeks ago I would have said there was real hope that a civilian leadership could be brought into power and could reach a *modus operandi* with the National Liberation Front; that they could set up administrative procedures whereby the country could be shared until such time as a full South Vietnam government could be elected.

In light of the recent attacks and in light of the severity and the inhumanity of the response of the South Vietnamese government and the United States—of calling in bombing attacks on their own cities and their own civilian population—in light of this, I'm not sure it is any longer a viable solution.

Perhaps the Viet Cong spokesman in Cambodia was right and the U.S. must be handed a stunning military defeat. Then I become terribly frightened as to what our response will be. Here is where the people in Saigon began wondering: If Khe Sanh falls, if another city or two is badly struck, if there are civilian uprisings—which I would not be surprised to see in the next few months because of what we are doing to defend the cities now—if this did happen, what would the response of the United States be? If Thieu and Ky fall, as Professor Galbraith suggests, what can we do?

I'm terribly afraid, as some of our Vietnamese friends over there were afraid, that we'll resort to even the greater fire power that we have. We'll lay rubble to everything, including perhaps using nuclear weapons. It's in this context that people get very worried. They have no confidence at all in restraint on the part of the United States.

We could be driven out by a Viet Cong victory, and I'm not sure that America would ever face that without going to all-out nuclear war. The only other thing you can hope for is that somehow the present American government is brought down, and that a government be brought into power which will arrange for America's withdrawal.

At this stage the one real answer is for the United States to recognize that the war it has tried to fight has been lost. It is neither winning militarily nor is it coming anywhere close to winning the hearts and minds of the people of Vietnam. Facing this, America has to be tough enough to withdraw from Vietnam as speedily as possible, leaving behind the civilian population of that country to work out their own destiny.

SPENDING CUTS

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, with the deepening of the fiscal crisis of the Na-

tion, an increasing number of Members of Congress have become concerned with the levels of spending forecast by the President's budget. I would not say there is a general optimism that Congress will prove sufficiently resourceful as to avoid another huge deficit this year. But I note with some encouragement the increasing willingness of Members of the Senate and the House, in advocating cuts in the budget and adjustment of priorities, to make specific proposals for cuts that they feel are warranted. This represents a healthy trend toward a meaningful dialog on spending reductions; each set of recommendations, in my view, should encourage all of us to evaluate similar programs of our own.

Yesterday, an able and distinguished group of Members of the House of Representatives announced a program of budget cuts netting reductions of \$4 billion and a set of reorganized priorities that would create a \$2.5 billion human renewal fund for fiscal year 1969. I found it a thought-provoking proposal, with much to recommend it. It merits the attention of all Members of Congress who seek responsibly to reduce expenditures. I ask unanimous consent that the statement of this program, together with tables of deferrals and allocations, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Joint statement of Representative Charles E. Goodell (R., N.Y. and member of House Republican Leadership) and Representatives W. E. (Bill) Brock (R., Tenn.), Albert H. Quile (R., Minn.), Howard W. Robison (R., N.Y.), Donald Rumsfeld (R., Ill.), William O. Cowger (R., Ky.), George Bush (R., Tex.), William A. Steiger (R., Wis.), William H. Ayres (R., O.), Alphonzo Bell (R., Cal.), Edward G. Blester Jr. (R., Pa.), Benjamin B. Blackburn (R., Ga.), Clarence J. Brown, Jr. (R., O.), Garry Brown (R., Mich.), James C. Cleveland (R., N.H.), Barber B. Conable, Jr. (R., N.Y.), Robert J. Corbett (R., Pa.), John R. Dellenback (R., Ore.), Robert V. Denney (R., Neb.), John N. Erlenborn (R., Ill.), Marvin L. Esch (R., Mich.), Paul Findley (R., Ill.), James C. Gardner (R., N.C.), James R. Grover, Jr. (R., N.Y.), Gilbert Gude (R., Md.), James Harvey (R., Mich.), Edward Hutchinson (R., Mich.), Hastings Keith (R., Mass.), Dan Kuykendall (R., Tenn.), Robert McClory (R., Ill.), Jack H. McDonald (R., Mich.), Clark MacGregor (R., Minn.), Charles McC. Mathias, Jr. (R., Md.), Thomas J. Meskill (R., Conn.), Robert H. Michel (R., Ill.), Rogers C. B. Morton (R., Md.), Charles A. Mosher (R., O.), Donald W. Riegle, Jr. (R., Mich.), William V. Roth (R., Del.), Herman T. Schneebeli (R., Pa.), Fred Schwengel (R., Ia.), J. William Stanton (R., O.), Burt L. Talcott (R., Cal.), Fletcher Thompson (R., Ga.), Guy Vander Jagt (R., Mich.), Charles W. Whalen Jr. (R., O.), William B. Widnall (R., N.J.), Roger H. Zion (R., Ind.):

"We urge immediate creation of a \$2.5 Billion Human Renewal Fund for fiscal year 1969 to meet urgent human needs and the urban crisis in our nation. Creation of the fund would be coupled with a \$6.5 Billion cutback in Federal expenditures in line with necessary wartime priorities.

"By firmly cutting \$6.5 Billion from the President's budget, we can responsibly plow back \$2.5 Billion into urgent human needs.

"This Administration has consistently refused to exercise the political integrity required to establish positive national spending priorities. Bowing to political pressures of the moment, it has allowed its attention

to drift from our most pressing human and urban needs. Congress cannot allow this drift to continue. We propose a new set of priorities, one which recognizes the enormous financial and economic difficulties facing us, but one which also recognizes the terrible human waste which is resulting from past and current inattention.

"\$500 Million would be allocated to mobilize private industry to provide meaningful jobs and training for the hard core unemployed and underemployed. To provide jobs with dignity, we urge immediate enactment of the Republican Human Investment Act and full funding of realistic manpower training programs. The Riot Commission recently endorsed this Republican initiative that we've urged for years. Our proposal also doubles the money for vocational education and technical training.

"Upon the same assumptions used in the President's budget, an additional \$250 Million of expenditures for housing in fiscal year 1969 would expand the successful Republican rent certificates program, fully fund the Percy-Widnall approach to stimulate private enterprise construction and expand the low income construction and rehabilitation incentive programs to produce an estimated total of 325,000 housing units.

"We would allocate \$250 Million more for air and water pollution control, and would double the money available to cope with the causes, prevention and control of crime.

"The rural problem of today is the urban problem of tomorrow. \$100 Million would be provided for a model tax credit approach to induce industry to expand in rural areas. Rural revitalization and growth must go hand in hand with programs to meet the human needs of the cities.

"It is long overdue for the Federal Government to demonstrate in its own front yard how to cope with pressing urban problems. The District of Columbia, as our nation's capital, is of concern to all the people of the country. We propose an additional \$50 Million Federal expenditure so that Washington, D.C., can become a model for the nation's cities.

"We propose deferrals totaling more than \$6.5 Billion in public works, public buildings, nonmilitary research, highway beautification, supersonic transport and other low priority programs such as government public relations. A limitation of agriculture subsidies to a maximum of \$10,000 per farmer is long overdue. Until the Foreign Aid Program is reorganized, we propose no increase above present levels of expenditure, Congress itself must economize by deferring major construction and new facilities on Capitol Hill.

"A cut-back of military personnel in Europe of about 200,000 leaves an ample force to maintain our treaty commitments in Europe. The President's request for 45,000 additional civilian personnel should be denied. We propose an average 3% reduction in civilian government employment, well below the normal annual attrition rate, so that no employees would lose their jobs involuntarily. Federal civilian employment has increased by 561,000 in the past seven years.

"Specific allocations outlined in the Human Renewal Action Program total \$1.5 Billion leaving an additional \$1 Billion to spend in other critical areas. Our proposal has been referred to the Republican Urban Affairs Task Force to seek the advice of America's foremost urban experts. The Task Force will conduct extensive hearings to determine the true priorities.

"Federal tax money alone will not solve these domestic problems. We must avoid promising any of our people an instant tomorrow that is impossible of attainment. It is imperative that we put first things first. While we are spending \$30 Billion a year on Viet Nam, desirable but low priority programs must be deferred. Only tough priorities will meet long neglected critical needs of our people."

Immediate budget deferrals

1. 60% Reduction of Military Personnel in Europe.....	\$2,080,000,000
2. Supersonic Transport (except R & D).....	222,000,000
3. Defense Supported Arms Sales Abroad.....	200,000,000
4. Civilian Space Program.....	400,000,000
5. Highway Beautification.....	85,000,000
6. Longworth House Office Building Renovation.....	6,058,000
7. Madison Library.....	2,500,000
8. Government Printing Office Building (Site Acquisition & Design).....	2,500,000
9. U.S.D.A. — \$10,000 Maximum Subsidy Limit Per Farm.....	410,000,000
10. Freeze on Moderate to High Income Apartment Program.....	400,000,000
11. Foreign Aid.....	700,000,000
12. Forest Roads Construction (50% New).....	45,790,000
13. Arts and Humanities Foundation.....	9,800,000
14. Public Buildings (Site Acquisition and Planning).....	5,497,000
15. Public Information.....	100,000,000
16. Post Office Buildings (50% Unobligated NOA).....	26,121,000
17. Freeze on Government Civilian Employment at 97%.....	961,000,000
18. National Science Foundation.....	250,000,000
19. Forest Highways (50% New Construction).....	15,000,000
20. Earth Description and Mapping (50% NOA).....	6,750,000
21. President's Contingency Reserve (1968 Level).....	400,000,000
22. Public Works (20% Stretch-Out).....	200,000,000
23. Appalachia (1968 Level).....	86,900,000
Total.....	6,614,916,500

Program allocations

[Amounts in millions]

Categories:	Amounts
1. Jobs:	
Human Investment.....	\$300
Job Opportunity Board.....	25
Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.....	2
Manpower Development & Training Act.....	103
Industry Youth Corps.....	70
	500
2. Education:	
Vocational Education and Technical Education for the future.....	250
3. Housing:	
Rent Certificates.....	50
*Low Income Construction Incentive Program (revolving).....	100
*Rehabilitation Incentive (revolving).....	100
	250
4. Pollution:	
Air and Water Pollution Control.....	250
5. Crime:	
Causes, Prevention and Control.....	100
6. Rural revitalization:	
Rural Growth—Tax Credit.....	100
7. District of Columbia.....	50
* Including Percy-Widnall Program.	

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business

today, it stand in adjournment until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

INTERFERENCE WITH CIVIL RIGHTS

(In accordance with the order entered March 4, 1968 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 4988), the Dirksen substitute, as amended thus far, is printed herewith.)

TITLE I—INTERFERENCE WITH FEDERALLY PROTECTED ACTIVITIES

SEC. 101. That chapter 13, civil rights, title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately at the end thereof the following new section, to read as follows:

"§ 245. Federally protected activities

"(a) (1) Nothing in this section shall be construed as indicating an intent on the part of Congress to prevent any State, any possession or Commonwealth of the United States, or the District of Columbia, from exercising jurisdiction over any offense over which it would have jurisdiction in the absence of this section, nor shall anything in this section be construed as depriving State and local law enforcement authorities of responsibility for prosecuting acts that may be violations of this section and that are violations of State and local law. No prosecution of any offense described in this section shall be undertaken by the United States except upon the certification in writing of the Attorney General or the Deputy Attorney General that in his judgment a prosecution by the United States is in the public interest and necessary to secure substantial justice, which function of certification may not be delegated.

"(2) Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to limit the authority of Federal officers, or a Federal grand jury, to investigate possible violations of this section.

"(b) Whoever, whether or not acting under color of law, by force or threat of force willfully injures, intimidates or interferes with, or attempts to injure, intimidate or interfere with,

"(1) any person because he is or has been, or in order to intimidate such person or any other person or any class of persons from—

"(A) voting or qualifying to vote, qualifying or campaigning as a candidate for elective office, or qualifying or acting as a poll watcher, or any legally authorized election official, in any primary, special, or general election;

"(B) participating in or enjoying any benefit, service, privilege, program, facility, or activity provided or administered by the United States;

"(C) applying for or enjoying employment, or any perk or privilege thereof, by any agency of the United States;

"(D) serving, or attending upon any court in connection with possible service, as a grand or petit juror in any court of the United States;

"(E) participating in or enjoying the benefits of any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance; or

"(2) any person because of his race, color, religion or national origin and because he is or has been—

"(A) enrolling in or attending any public school or public college;

"(B) participating in or enjoying any benefit, service, privilege, program, facility or activity provided or administered by any State or subdivision thereof;

"(C) applying for or enjoying employment, or any perk or privilege thereof, by any private employer or any agency of any State or subdivision thereof, or joining or using the services or advantages of any labor organization, hiring hall, or employment agency;

"(D) serving, or attending upon any court

of any State in connection with possible service, as a grand or petit juror;

"(E) traveling in or using any facility of interstate commerce, or using any vehicle, terminal, or facility of any common carrier by motor, rail, water, or air;

"(F) enjoying the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations of any inn, hotel, motel, or other establishment which provides lodging to transient guests, or of any restaurant, cafeteria, lunchroom, lunch counter, soda fountain, or other facility which serves the public and which is principally engaged in selling food or beverages for consumption on the premises, or of any gasoline station, or of any motion picture house, theater, concert hall, sports arena, stadium, or any other place of exhibition or entertainment which serves the public, or of any other establishment which serves the public and (i) which is located within the premises of any of the aforesaid establishments or within the premises of which is physically located any of the aforesaid establishments, and (ii) which holds itself out as serving patrons of such establishments; or

"(3) during or incident to a riot or civil disorder, any person engaged in a business in commerce or affecting commerce, including, but not limited to, any person engaged in a business which sells or offers for sale to interstate travelers a substantial portion of the articles, commodities, or services which it sells or where a substantial portion of the articles or commodities which it sells or offers for sale have moved in commerce; or

"(4) any person because he is or has been, or in order to intimidate such person or any other person or any class of persons from—

"(A) participating, without discrimination on account of race, color, religion or national origin, in any of the benefits or activities described in subparagraphs (1) (A) through (1) (E) or subparagraphs (2) (A) through (2) (F); or

"(B) affording another person or class of persons opportunity or protection to so participate; or

"(5) any citizen because he is or has been, or in order to discourage such citizen or any other citizen from lawfully aiding or encouraging other persons to participate, without discrimination on account of race, color, religion or national origin, in any of the benefits or activities described in subparagraphs (1) (A) through (1) (E) or subparagraphs (2) (A) through (2) (F), or participating lawfully in speech or peaceful assembly opposing any denial of the opportunity to so participate—

shall be fined not more than \$1,000, or imprisoned not more than one year, or both; and if bodily injury results shall be fined not more than \$10,000, or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both; and if death results shall be subject to imprisonment for any term of years or for life. As used in this section, the term 'participating lawfully in speech or peaceful assembly' shall not mean the aiding, abetting, or inciting of other persons to riot or to commit any act of physical violence upon any individual or against any real or personal property in furtherance of a riot. Nothing in subparagraph (2) (F) or (3) (A) of this subsection shall apply to the proprietor of any establishment which provides lodging to transient guests, or to any employee acting on behalf of such proprietor, with respect to the enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations of such establishment if such establishment is located within a building which contains not more than five rooms for rent or hire and which is actually occupied by the proprietor as his residence.

"(d) Nothing in this section shall be construed so as to deter any law enforcement officer from lawfully carrying out the duties of his office; and no law enforcement officer shall be considered to be in violation of this

section for lawfully carrying out the duties of his office or lawfully enforcing ordinances and laws of the United States, the District of Columbia, any of the several States, or any political subdivision of a State. For purposes of the preceding sentence, the term 'law enforcement officer' means any officer of the United States, the District of Columbia, a State, or political subdivision of a State, who is empowered by law to conduct investigations of, or make arrests because of, offenses against the United States, the District of Columbia, a State, or a political subdivision of a State."

(c) Nothing contained in this section shall apply to or affect activities under title II of this Act.

(d) The provisions of this section shall not apply to acts or omissions on the part of law enforcement officers, members of the National Guard, as defined in section 101(9) of title 10, United States Code, members of the organized militia of any State or the District of Columbia, not covered by such section 101(9), or members of the Armed Forces of the United States, who are engaged in suppressing a riot or civil disturbance or restoring law and order during a riot or civil disturbance.

SEC. 102. The analysis of chapter 13 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"245. Federally protected activities."

SEC. 103. (a) Section 241 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking out the final paragraph thereof and substituting the following:

"They shall be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both; and if death results, they shall be subject to imprisonment for any term of years or for life."

(b) Section 242 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and adding the following: "; and if death results shall be subject to imprisonment for any term of years or for life."

(c) Subsections (a) and (c) of section 12 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (79 Stat. 443, 444) are amended by striking out the words "or (b)" following the words "11(a)".

SEC. 104. (a) Title 18 of the United States Code is amended by inserting, immediately after chapter 101 thereof, the following new chapter:

"CHAPTER 102.—RIOTS

"Sec.

"2101. Riots.

"2102. Definitions.

"§ 2101. Riots

"(a) (1) Whoever travels in interstate or foreign commerce or uses any facility of interstate or foreign commerce, including, but not limited to, the mail, telegraph, telephone, radio, or television, with intent—

"(A) to incite a riot; or

"(B) to organize, promote, encourage, participate in, or carry on a riot; or

"(C) to commit any act of violence in furtherance of a riot; or

"(D) to aid or abet any person in inciting or participating in or carrying on a riot or committing any act of violence in furtherance of a riot;

and who either during the course of any such travel or use or thereafter performs or attempts to perform any other overt act for any purpose specified in subparagraph (A), (B), (C), or (D) of this paragraph;

"Shall be fined not more than \$10,000, or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

"(b) In any prosecution under this section, proof that a defendant engaged or attempted to engage in one or more of the overt acts described in subparagraph (A), (B), (C), or (D) of paragraph (1) of subsection (a) and (1) has traveled in interstate or foreign commerce, or (2) has use of or used any facility of interstate or foreign commerce; including but not limited to, mail, telegraph,

telephone, radio, or television, to communicate with or broadcast to any person or group of persons prior to such overt acts, such travel or use shall be admissible proof to establish that such defendant traveled in or used such facility of interstate or foreign commerce.

"(c) A judgment of conviction or acquittal on the merits under the laws of any State shall be a bar to any prosecution hereunder for the same act or acts.

"(d) Whenever, in the opinion of the Attorney General or of the appropriate officer of the Department of Justice charged by law or under the instructions of the Attorney General with authority to act, any person shall have violated this chapter, the Department shall proceed as speedily as possible with a prosecution of such person hereunder and with any appeal which may lie from any decision adverse to the Government resulting from such prosecution; or in the alternative shall report in writing, to the respective Houses of the Congress, the Department's reason for not so proceeding.

"(e) Nothing contained in this section shall be construed to make it unlawful for any person to travel in, or use any facility of, interstate or foreign commerce for the purpose of pursuing the legitimate objectives of organized labor, through orderly and lawful means.

"(f) Nothing in this section shall be construed as indicating an intent on the part of Congress to prevent any State, any possession or Commonwealth of the United States, or the District of Columbia, from exercising jurisdiction over any offense over which it would have jurisdiction in the absence of this section; nor shall anything in this section be construed as depriving State and local law enforcement authorities of responsibility for prosecuting acts that may be violations of this section and that are violations of State and local law.

"§ 2102. Definitions

"(a) As used in this chapter, the term 'riot' means a public disturbance involving (1) an act or acts of violence by one or more persons part of an assemblage of three or more persons, which act or acts shall constitute a clear and present danger of, or shall result in, damage or injury to the property of any other person or to the person of any other individual or (2) a threat or threats of the commission of an act or acts of violence by one or more persons part of an assemblage of three or more persons having, individually or collectively, the ability of immediate execution of such threat or threats, where the performance of the threatened act or acts of violence would constitute a clear and present danger of, or would result in, damage or injury to the property of any other person or to the person of any other individual.

"(b) As used in this chapter, the term 'to incite a riot', or 'to organize, promote, encourage, participate in, or carry on a riot', includes, but is not limited to, urging or instigating other persons to riot, but shall not be deemed to mean the mere oral or written (1) advocacy of ideas or (2) expression of belief, not involving advocacy of any act or acts of violence or assertion of the rightness of, or the right to commit, any such act or acts."

(b) The table of contents to "PART I.—CRIMES" of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the following chapter reference:

"101. Records and reports..... 2071"
a new chapter reference as follows:

"102. Riots..... 2101".

TITLE II—FAIR HOUSING POLICY

SEC. 201. It is the policy of the United States to provide, within constitutional limitations, for fair housing throughout the United States.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 202. As used in this title—

(a) "Secretary" means the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

(b) "Dwelling" means any building, structure, or portion thereof which is occupied as, or designed or intended for occupancy as, a residence by one or more families, and any vacant land which is offered for sale or lease for the construction or location thereon of any such building, structure, or portion thereof.

(c) "Family" includes a single individual.

(d) "Person" includes one or more individuals, corporations, partnerships, associations, labor organizations, legal representatives, mutual companies, joint-stock companies, trusts, unincorporated organizations, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, receivers, and fiduciaries.

(e) "To rent" includes to lease, to sublease, to let and otherwise to grant for a consideration the right to occupy premises not owned by the occupant.

(f) "Discriminatory housing practice" means an act that is unlawful under section 204, 205, or 206.

(g) "State" means any of the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or any of the territories and possessions of the United States.

EFFECTIVE DATES OF CERTAIN PROHIBITIONS

SEC. 203. (a) Subject to the provisions of subsection (b) and section 207, the prohibitions against discrimination in the sale or rental of housing set forth in section 204 shall apply:

(1) Upon enactment of this title, to—

(A) dwellings owned or operated by the Federal Government;

(B) dwellings provided in whole or in part with the aid of loans, advances, grants, or contributions made by the Federal Government, under agreements entered into after November 20, 1962, unless payment due thereon has been made in full prior to the date of enactment of this title;

(C) dwellings provided in whole or in part by loans insured, guaranteed, or otherwise secured by the credit of the Federal Government, under agreements entered into after November 20, 1962, unless payment thereon has been made in full prior to the date of enactment of this title: Provided, That nothing contained in subsection (B) and (C) of this subparagraph shall be applicable to dwellings solely by virtue of the fact that they are subject to mortgages held by an FDIC or FSLIC institution; and

(D) dwellings provided by the development or the redevelopment of real property purchased, rented, or otherwise obtained from a State or local public agency receiving Federal financial assistance for slum clearance or urban renewal with respect to such real property under loan or grant contracts entered into after November 20, 1962.

(2) After December 31, 1968, to all dwellings covered by paragraph (1) and to all other dwellings except as exempted by subsection (b).

(b) Nothing in section 204 (other than paragraph (c)) shall apply to—

(1) any single-family house sold or rented by an owner: *Provided*, That such private individual owner does not own more than three such single-family houses at any one time: *Provided further*, That in the case of the sale of any such single-family house by a private individual owner not residing in such house at the time of such sale or who was not the most recent resident of such house prior to such sale, the exemption granted by this subsection shall apply only with respect to one such sale within any twenty-four month period: *Provided further*, That such bona fide private individual owner does not own any interest in, nor is there owned or reserved on his behalf, under any express or voluntary agreement, title to or

any right to all or a portion of the proceeds from the sale or rental of, more than three such single-family houses at any one time: *Provided further*, That after December 31, 1969, the sale or rental of any such single-family house shall be excepted from the application of this title only if such house is sold or rented (A) without the use in any manner of the sales or rental facilities or the sales or rental services of any real estate broker, agent, or salesman, or of such facilities or services of any person in the business of selling or renting dwellings, or of any employee or agent of any such broker, agent, salesman, or person and (B) without the publication, posting or mailing, after notice, of any advertisement or written notice in violation of section 204(c) of this title; but nothing in this proviso shall prohibit the use of attorneys, escrow agents, abstractors, title companies, and other such professional assistance as necessary to perfect or transfer the title, or

(2) rooms or units in dwellings containing living quarters occupied or intended to be occupied by no more than four families living independently of each other, if the owner actually maintains and occupies one of such living quarters as his residence.

(c) For the purposes of subsection (b), a person shall be deemed to be in the business of selling or renting dwellings if—

(1) he has, within the preceding twelve months, participated as principal in three or more transactions involving the sale or rental of any dwelling or any interest therein, or

(2) he has, within the preceding twelve months, participated as agent, other than in the sale of his own personal residence in providing sales or rental facilities or sales or rental services in two or more transactions involving the sale or rental of any dwelling or any interest therein, or

(3) he is the owner of any dwelling designed or intended for occupancy by, or occupied by, five or more families.

DISCRIMINATION IN THE SALE OR RENTAL OF HOUSING

SEC. 204. As made applicable by section 203 and except as exempted by sections 203(b) and 207, it shall be unlawful—

(a) To refuse to sell or rent after the making of a bona fide offer, or to refuse to negotiate for the sale or rental of, or otherwise make unavailable or deny, a dwelling to any person because of race, color, religion, or national origin.

(b) To discriminate against any person in the terms, conditions, or privileges of sale or rental of a dwelling, or in the provision of services or facilities in connection therewith, because of race, color, religion, or national origin.

(c) To make, print, or publish, or cause to be made, printed, or published any notice, statement, or advertisement, with respect to the sale or rental of a dwelling that indicates any preference, limitation, or discrimination based on race, color, religion, or national origin, or an intention to make any such preference, limitation, or discrimination.

(d) To represent to any person because of race, color, religion, or national origin that any dwelling is not available for inspection, sale, or rental when such dwelling is in fact so available.

(e) For profit, to induce or attempt to induce any person to sell or rent any dwelling by representations regarding the entry or prospective entry into the neighborhood of a person or persons of a particular race, color, religion, or national origin.

DISCRIMINATION IN THE FINANCING OF HOUSING

SEC. 205. After December 31, 1968, it shall be unlawful for any bank, building and loan association, insurance company or other corporation, association, firm or enterprise whose business consists in whole or in part in the making of commercial real estate

loans, to deny a loan or other financial assistance to a person applying therefor for the purpose of purchasing, constructing, improving, repairing, or maintaining a dwelling, or to discriminate against him in the fixing of the amount, interest rate, duration, or other terms or conditions of such loan or other financial assistance, because of the race, color, religion, or national origin of such person or of any person associated with him in connection with such loan or other financial assistance or the purposes of such loan or other financial assistance, or of the present or prospective owners, lessees, tenants, or occupants of the dwelling or dwellings in relation to which such loan or other financial assistance is to be made or given, provided that nothing contained in this section shall impair the scope or effectiveness of the exception contained in section 203(b).

DISCRIMINATION IN THE PROVISION OF BROKERAGE SERVICES

SEC. 206. After December 31, 1968, it shall be unlawful to deny any person access to or membership or participation in any multiple-listing service, real estate brokers' organization or other service, organization, or facility relating to the business of selling or renting dwellings, or to discriminate against him in the terms or conditions of such access, membership, or participation, on account of race, color, religion, or national origin.

EXEMPTION

SEC. 207. Nothing in this title shall prohibit a religious organization, association, or society, or any nonprofit institution or organization operated, supervised or controlled by or in conjunction with a religious organization, association, or society, from limiting the sale, rental or occupancy of dwellings which it owns or operates for other than a commercial purpose to persons of the same religion, or from giving preference to such persons, unless membership in such religion is restricted on account of race, color, or national origin. Nor shall anything in this title prohibit a private club not in fact open to the public, which as an incident to its primary purpose or purposes provides lodgings which it owns or operates for other than a commercial purpose, from limiting the rental or occupancy of such lodgings to its members or from giving preference to its members.

ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 208. (a) The authority and responsibility for administering this Act shall be in the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

(b) The Department of Housing and Urban Development shall be provided an additional Assistant Secretary. The Department of Housing and Urban Development Act (Public Law 89-174, 79 Stat. 667) is hereby amended by—

(1) striking the word "four," in section 4(a) of said Act (79 Stat. 668; 5 U.S.C. 624b (a)) and substituting therefor "five,"; and

(2) striking the word "six," in section 7 of said Act (79 Stat. 669; 5 U.S.C. 624(c)) and substituting therefor "seven."

(c) The Secretary may delegate any of his functions, duties, and powers to employees of the Department of Housing and Urban Development or to boards of such employees, including functions, duties, and powers with respect to investigating, conciliating, hearing, determining, ordering, certifying, reporting, or otherwise acting as to any work, business, or matter under this title. The persons to whom such delegations are made with respect to hearing functions, duties, and powers shall be appointed and shall serve in the Department of Housing and Urban Development in compliance with sections 3105, 3344, 5362, and 7521 of title 5 of the United States Code. Insofar as possible, conciliation meetings shall be held in the cities or other localities where the discriminatory housing practices allegedly occurred. The Secretary

shall by rule prescribe such rights of appeal from the decisions of his hearing examiners to other hearing examiners or to other officers in the Department, to boards of officers or to himself, as shall be appropriate and in accordance with law.

(d) All executive departments and agencies shall administer their programs and activities relating to housing and urban development in a manner affirmatively to further the purposes of this title and shall cooperate with the Secretary to further such purposes.

(e) The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall—

(1) make studies with respect to the nature and extent of discriminatory housing practices in representative communities, urban, suburban, and rural, throughout the United States;

(2) publish and disseminate reports, recommendations, and information derived from such studies;

(3) cooperate with and render technical assistance to Federal, State, local, and other public or private agencies, organizations, and institutions which are formulating or carrying on programs to prevent or eliminate discriminatory housing practices;

(4) cooperate with and render such technical and other assistance to the Community Relations Service as may be appropriate to further its activities in preventing or eliminating discriminatory housing practices; and

(5) administer the programs and activities relating to housing and urban development in a manner affirmatively to further the policies of this title.

EDUCATION AND CONCILIATION

SEC. 209. Immediately after the enactment of this title the Secretary shall commence such educational and conciliatory activities as in his judgment will further the purposes of this title. He shall call conferences of persons in the housing industry and other interested parties to acquaint them with the provisions of this title and his suggested means of implementing it, and shall endeavor with their advice to work out programs of voluntary compliance and of enforcement. He may pay per diem, travel, and transportation expenses for persons attending such conferences as provided in section 5703 of title 5 of the United States Code. He shall consult with State and local officials and other interested parties to learn the extent, if any, to which housing discrimination exists in their State or locality, and whether and how State or local enforcement programs might be utilized to combat such discrimination in connection with or in place of, the Secretary's enforcement of this title. The Secretary shall issue reports on such conferences and consultations as he deems appropriate.

ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 210. (a) Any person who claims to have been injured by a discriminatory housing practice or who believes that he will be irrevocably injured by a discriminatory housing practice that is about to occur (hereafter "person aggrieved") may file a complaint with the Secretary. Complaints shall be in writing and shall contain such information and be in such form as the Secretary requires. Upon receipt of such a complaint the Secretary shall furnish a copy of the same to the person or persons who allegedly committed or are about to commit the alleged discriminatory housing practice. Within thirty days after receiving a complaint, or within thirty days after the expiration of any period of reference under subsection (c), the Secretary shall investigate the complaint and give notice in writing to the person aggrieved whether he intends to resolve it. If the Secretary decides to resolve the complaint, he shall proceed to try to eliminate or correct the alleged discriminatory housing practice by informal methods of conference, conciliation, and persuasion. Nothing said or done in the course of such informal endeavors may be

made public or used as evidence in a subsequent proceeding under this title without the written consent of the persons concerned. Any employee of the Secretary who shall make public any information in violation of this provision shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year.

(b) A complaint under subsection (a) shall be filed within one hundred and eighty days after the alleged discriminatory housing practice occurred. Complaints shall be in writing and shall state the facts upon which the allegations of a discriminatory housing practice are based. Complaints may be reasonably and fairly amended at any time. A respondent may file an answer to the complaint against him and with the leave of the Secretary, which shall be granted whenever it would be reasonable and fair to do so, may amend his answer at any time. Both complaints and answers shall be verified.

(c) Wherever a State or local fair housing law provides rights and remedies for alleged discriminatory housing practices which are substantially equivalent to the rights and remedies provided in this title, the Secretary shall notify the appropriate State or local agency of any complaint filed under this title which appears to constitute a violation of such State or local fair housing law, and the Secretary shall take no further action with respect to such complaint if the appropriate State or local law enforcement official has, within thirty days from the date the alleged offense has been brought to his attention, commenced proceedings in the matter, or, having done so, carries forward such proceedings with reasonable promptness. In no event shall the Secretary take further action unless he certifies that in his judgment, under the circumstances of the particular case, the protection of the rights of the parties or the interests of justice require such action.

(d) If within thirty days after a complaint is filed with the Secretary or within thirty days after expiration of any period of reference under subsection (c), the Secretary has been unable to obtain voluntary compliance with this title, the person aggrieved may, within thirty days thereafter, commence a civil action in any appropriate United States district court, against the respondent named in the complaint, to enforce the rights granted or protected by this title, insofar as such rights relate to the subject of the complaint: Provided, That no such civil action may be brought in any United States district court if the person aggrieved has a judicial remedy under a State or local fair housing law which provides rights and remedies for alleged discriminatory housing practices which are substantially equivalent to the rights and remedies provided in this title. Such actions may be brought without regard to the amount in controversy in any United States district court for the district in which the discriminatory housing practice is alleged to have occurred or be about to occur or in which the respondent resides or transacts business. If the court finds that a discriminatory housing practice has occurred or is about to occur, the court may, subject to the provisions of section 212, enjoin the respondent from engaging in such practice or order such affirmative action as may be appropriate.

(e) If any proceeding brought pursuant to this section, the burden of proof shall be on the complainant.

(f) Whenever an action filed by an individual, in either Federal or State court, pursuant to this section or section 212, shall come to trial the Secretary shall immediately terminate all efforts to obtain voluntary compliance.

INVESTIGATIONS; SUBPENAS; GIVING OF EVIDENCE

SEC. 211. (a) In conducting an investigation the Secretary shall have access at all reasonable times to premises, records, docu-

ments, individuals, and other evidence or possible sources of evidence and may examine, record, and copy such materials and take and record the testimony or statements of such persons as are reasonably necessary for the furtherance of the investigation: Provided, however, The Secretary first complies with the provisions of the Fourth Amendment relating to unreasonable searches and seizures. The Secretary may issue subpoenas to compel his access to or the production of such materials, or the appearance of such persons, and may issue interrogatories to a respondent, to the same extent and subject to the same limitations as would apply if the subpoenas or interrogatories were issued or served in aid of a civil action in the United States district court for the district in which the investigation is taking place. The Secretary may administer oaths.

(b) Upon written application to the Secretary, a respondent shall be entitled to the issuance of a reasonable number of subpoenas by and in the name of the Secretary to the same extent and subject to the same limitations as subpoenas issued by the Secretary himself. Subpoenas issued at the request of a respondent shall show on their face the name and address of such respondent and shall state that they were issued at his request.

(c) Witnesses summoned by subpoena of the Secretary shall be entitled to the same witness and mileage fees as are witnesses in proceedings in United States district courts. Fees payable to a witness summoned by a subpoena issued at the request of a respondent shall be paid by him.

(d) Within five days after service of a subpoena upon any person, such person may petition the Secretary to revoke or modify the subpoena. The Secretary shall grant the petition if he finds that the subpoena requires appearance or attendance at an unreasonable time or place, that it requires production of evidence which does not relate to any matter under investigation, that it does not describe with sufficient particularity the evidence to be produced, that compliance would be unduly onerous, or for other good reason.

(e) In case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpoena, the Secretary or other person at whose request it was issued may petition for its enforcement in the United States district court for the district in which the person to whom the subpoena was addressed resides, was served, or transacts business.

(f) Any person who willfully fails or neglects to attend and testify or to answer any lawful inquiry or to produce records, documents, or other evidence, if in his power to do so, in obedience to the subpoena or lawful order of the Secretary, shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both. Any person who, with intent thereby to mislead the Secretary, shall make or cause to be made any false entry or statement of fact in any report, account, record, or other document submitted to the Secretary pursuant to his subpoena or other order, or shall willfully neglect or fail to make or cause to be made full, true, and correct entries in such reports, accounts, records, or other documents, or shall willfully mutilate, alter, or by any other means falsify any documentary evidence, shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

(g) The Attorney General shall conduct all litigation in which the Secretary participates as a party or as amicus pursuant to this Act.

ENFORCEMENT BY PRIVATE PERSONS

SEC. 212. (a) The rights granted by sections 203, 204, 205, and 206 may be enforced by civil actions in appropriate United States district courts without regard to the amount in controversy and in appropriate State or local courts of general jurisdiction. A civil action shall be commenced within one hundred and eighty days after the alleged dis-

criminatory housing practice occurred: *Provided, however*, That the court shall continue such civil case brought pursuant to this section or section 210D from time to time before bringing it to trial if the court believes that the conciliation efforts of the Secretary or a State or local agency are likely to result in satisfactory settlement of the discriminatory housing practice complained of in the complaint made to the Secretary or to the local or State agency and which practice forms the basis for the action in court: *And provided, however*, That any sale, encumbrance, or rental consummated prior to the issuance of any court order issued under the authority of this Act, and involving a bona fide purchaser, encumbrancer, or tenant without actual notice of the existence of the filing of a complaint or civil action under the provisions of this Act shall not be affected.

(b) Upon application by the plaintiff and in such circumstances as the court may deem just, a court of the United States in which a civil action under this section has been brought may appoint an attorney for the plaintiff and may authorize the commencement of a civil action upon proper showing without the payment of fees, costs, or security. A court of a State or subdivision thereof may do likewise to the extent not inconsistent with the law or procedures of the State or subdivision.

(c) The court may grant as relief, as it deems appropriate, any permanent or temporary injunction, temporary restraining order, or other order, and may award to the plaintiff actual damages and not more than \$1,000 punitive damages, together with court costs and reasonable attorney fees in the case of a prevailing plaintiff: *Provided*, That the said plaintiff in the opinion of the court is not financially able to assume said attorney's fees.

ENFORCEMENT BY THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

SEC. 213. (a) Whenever the Attorney General has reasonable cause to believe that any person or group of persons is engaged in a pattern or practice of resistance to the full enjoyment of any of the rights granted by this title, or that any group of persons has been denied any of the rights granted by this title and such denial raises an issue of general public importance, he may bring a civil action in any appropriate United States district court by filing with it a complaint setting forth the facts and requesting such preventive relief, including an application for a permanent or temporary injunction, restraining order, or other order against the person or persons responsible for such pattern or practice or denial of rights, as he deems necessary to insure the full enjoyment of the rights granted by this title.

EXPEDITION OF PROCEEDINGS

SEC. 214. Any court in which a proceeding is instituted under section 212 or 213 of this title shall assign the case for hearing at the earliest practicable date and cause the case to be in every way expedited.

EFFECT ON STATE LAWS

SEC. 215. Nothing in this title shall be construed to invalidate or limit any law of a State or political subdivision of a State, or of any other jurisdiction in which this title shall be effective, that grants, guarantees, or protects the same rights as are granted by this title; but any law of a State, a political subdivision, or other such jurisdiction that purports to require or permit any action that would be a discriminatory housing practice under this title shall to that extent be invalid.

COOPERATION WITH STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES ADMINISTERING FAIR HOUSING LAWS

SEC. 216. The Secretary may cooperate with State and local agencies charged with the administration of State and local fair housing laws and, with the consent of such agen-

cies, utilize the services of such agencies and their employees and, notwithstanding any other provision of law, may reimburse such agencies and their employees for services rendered to assist him in carrying out this title. In furtherance of such cooperative efforts, the Secretary may enter into written agreements with such State or local agencies. All agreements and terminations thereof shall be published in the Federal Register.

INTERFERENCE, COERCION, OR INTIMIDATION

SEC. 217. It shall be unlawful to coerce, intimidate, threaten, or interfere with any person in the exercise or enjoyment of, or on account of his having exercised or enjoyed, or on account of his having aided or encouraged any other person in the exercise or enjoyment of, any right granted or protected by section 203, 204, 205, or 206. This section may be enforced by appropriate civil action.

APPROPRIATION

SEC. 218. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this title.

SEPARABILITY OF PROVISIONS

SEC. 219. If any provision of this title or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the remainder of the title and the application of the provision to other persons not similarly situated or to other circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

TITLE III

PREVENTION OF INTIMIDATION IN FAIR HOUSING CASES

SEC. 301. Whoever, whether or not acting under color of law, by force or threat of force willfully injures, intimidates or interferes with, or attempts to inquire, intimidate or interfere with—

(a) any person because of his race, color, religion or national origin and because he is or has been selling, purchasing, renting, financing, occupying, or contracting or negotiating for the sale, rental, financing or occupation of any dwelling, or applying for or participating in any service, organization, or facility relating to the business of selling or renting dwellings; or

(b) any person because he is or has been, or in order to intimidate such person or any other person or any class of persons from—

(1) participating, without discrimination on account of race, color, religion or national origin, in any of the activities, services, organizations or facilities described in subsection 301(a); or

(2) affording another person or class of persons opportunity or protection so to participate; or

(c) any citizen because he is or has been, or in order to discourage such citizen or any other citizen from lawfully aiding or encouraging others to participate, without discrimination on account of race, color, religion or national origin, in any of the activities, services, organizations or facilities described in subsection 301(a), or participating lawfully in speech or peaceful assembly opposing and denial of the opportunity to so participate—shall be fined not more than \$1,000, or imprisoned not more than one year, or both; and if bodily injury results shall be fined not more than \$10,000, or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both; and if death results be subject to imprisonment for any term of years or for life.

TITLE IV—CIVIL OBEDIENCE

SHORT TITLE

SEC. 401. This title may be cited as the "Civil Obedience Act of 1968".

CRIMINAL PENALTIES FOR ACTS COMMITTED IN CIVIL DISORDERS

SEC. 402. (a) Title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after chapter 11 thereof the following new chapter:

CHAPTER 12.—CIVIL DISORDERS

"Sec.

"231. Civil disorders.

"232. Definitions.

"233. Preemption.

"§ 231. Civil disorders

"(a) (1) Whoever teaches or demonstrates to any other person the use, application, or making of any firearm or explosive or incendiary device, or technique capable of causing injury or death to persons, knowing or having reason to know or intending that the same will be unlawfully employed for use in, or in furtherance of, a civil disorder which may in any way or degree obstruct, delay, or adversely affect commerce or the movement of any article or commodity in commerce or the conduct or performance of any federally protected function; or

"(2) Whoever transports or manufactures for transportation in commerce any firearm, or explosive or incendiary device, knowing or having reason to know or intending that the same will be used unlawfully in furtherance of a civil disorder; or

"(3) Whoever commits or attempts to commit any act to obstruct, impede, or interfere with any fireman or law enforcement officer lawfully engaged in the lawful performance of his official duties incident to and during the commission of a civil disorder which in any way or degree obstructs, delays, or adversely affects commerce or the movement of any article or commodity in commerce or the conduct or performance of any federally protected function—

"Shall be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

"(b) Nothing contained in this section shall make unlawful any act of any law enforcement officer which is performed in the lawful performance of his official duties.

"§ 232. Definitions

"For purposes of this chapter:

"(1) The term 'civil disorder' means any public disturbance involving acts of violence by assemblages of three or more persons, which causes an immediate danger of or results in damage or injury to the property or person of any other individual.

"(2) The term 'commerce' means commerce (A) between any State or the District of Columbia and any place outside thereof; (B) between points within any State or the District of Columbia, but through any place outside thereof; or (C) wholly within the District of Columbia.

"(3) The term 'federally protected function' means any function, operation, or action carried out, under the laws of the United States, by any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States or by an officer or employee thereof; and such term shall specifically include, but not be limited to, the collection, and distribution of the United States mails.

"(4) The term 'firearm' means any weapon which is designed to or may readily be converted to expel any projectile by the action of an explosive; or the frame or receiver of any such weapon.

"(5) The term 'explosive or incendiary device' means (A) dynamite and all other forms of high explosives, (B) any explosive bomb, grenade, missile, or similar device, and (C) any incendiary bomb or grenade, fire bomb, or similar device, including any device which (i) consists of or includes a breakable container including a flammable liquid or compound, and a wick composed of any material which, when ignited, is capable of igniting such flammable liquid or compound, and (ii) can be carried or thrown by one individual acting alone.

"(6) The term 'fireman' means any member of a fire department (including a volunteer fire department) of any State, any political subdivision of a State, or the District of Columbia.

"(7) The term 'law enforcement officer' means any officer or employee of the United States, any State, any political subdivision of a State, or the District of Columbia, while engaged in the enforcement or prosecution of any of the criminal laws of the United States, a State, any political subdivision of a State, or the District of Columbia; and such term shall specifically include, but shall not be limited to, members of the National Guard, as defined in section 101 (9) of title 10, United States Code, members of the organized militia of any State, or territory of the United States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or the District of Columbia, not included within the definition of National Guard as defined by such section 101 (9), and members of the Armed Forces of the United States, while engaged in suppressing acts of violence or restoring law and order during a civil disorder.

"§ 233. Preemption

"Nothing contained in this chapter shall be construed as indicating an intent on the part of Congress to occupy the field in which any provisions of the chapter operate to the exclusion of State or local laws on the same subject matter, nor shall any provision of this chapter be construed to invalidate any provision of State law unless such provision is inconsistent with any of the purposes of this chapter or any provision thereof."

(b) The table of contents to "PART I.—CRIMES" of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after

"11. Bribery and graft..... 211"
a new chapter reference as follows:

"12. Civil disorders..... 231".

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, for the information of Senators, there will be no period for the transaction of routine morning business tomorrow morning, and time on the bill will commence immediately after the prayer and the reading of the Journal.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, March 8, 1968, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 7, 1968:

FOREIGN CLAIMS SETTLEMENT COMMISSION

Sidney Freidberg, of New York, to be a member of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States for the remainder of the term of 3 years from October 22, 1967, vice LaVern R. Dilweg.

TAX COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

The following-named persons to be judges of the Tax Court of the United States for the term of 12 years from June 2, 1968:

William M. Drennen, of West Virginia (reappointment).

William M. Fay, of Pennsylvania (reappointment).

C. Moxley Featherston, of Virginia (reappointment).

Charles R. Simpson, of Illinois (reappointment).

IN THE NAVY

The following-named Reserve Officers of the U.S. Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of rear admiral:

LINE

Ralph S. Garrison	John H. Hoefler
Stewart W. Hopkins	Jim K. Carpenter
States M. Mead	William S. Mailliard
Chester H. Taylor, Jr.	A. Atley Peterson
Edelen A. Parker	Dallas F. Jordan

MEDICAL CORPS

Robert A. Conard, Jr.
Richard H. Kiene
Robert E. Switzer

SUPPLY CORPS

Charles W. Shattuck J. Edwin Gay
Leslie T. Maiman Paul N. Howell

CHAPLAIN CORPS

Ray C. Tindall

DENTAL CORPS

Francis J. Fabrizio

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, March 7, 1968

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Watch ye, stand fast in the faith, quit you like men, be strong.—I Corinthians 16: 13.

God of the ages, everywhere present, everywhere available, and everywhere seeking to enter the heart of man to strengthen him and to sustain him. Be Thou with us this day and reveal Thy way to our waiting hearts. Make us so

conscious of Thy presence and so receptive to the leading of Thy spirit that we shall be directed into right paths, make wise decisions, and formulate great plans for the welfare of all our people and the well-being of our world.

With patience and perseverance may we meet the problems that confront us and the conflicts that rage about us. Together may we stand firm in our faith, be strong, and do all things in love.

We remember before Thee one of our leaders who has entered his eternal

home. We thank Thee for him and for the contribution he made to our country and to our lives. Receive him into the glory of Thy presence, comfort his family, and make us all aware of the fact that in life and in death Thou art with us. In the Master's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2531. An act to designate the San Gabriel Wilderness, Angeles National Forest, in the State of California.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2419. An act to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, with respect to the development of cargo container vessels, and for other purposes.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF MARCH 11

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of inquiring of the distinguished majority leader as to the program for the remainder of this week and the schedule for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the distinguished minority leader, we will adjourn today after tributes to our late beloved former colleague, Joseph W. Martin, Jr. We will put our legislative business over to next week.

The business for next week will be as follows: Monday is District Day, but there are no District bills. We will have on Monday H.R. 13058, repealing certain acts relating to containers for fruits and vegetables under an open rule with 1 hour of debate.

Mr. Speaker, for the consideration of the House on Tuesday and for the balance of the week are the following:

H.R. 14910, regulation of devices capable of causing radio interference, under an open rule with 1 hour of general debate.

House Resolution 1031, to authorize the Committee on Veterans' Affairs to investigate certain matters within its jurisdiction.

H.R. 14933, overtime differential for postal service employees under an open rule with 1 hour of general debate.

House Joint Resolution 1052, employment opportunities for Vietnam era veterans, which consideration is subject to a rule being granted thereon.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, this announcement is made subject to the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time and that any further program may be announced later.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished majority leader for his announcement of the legislative program.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY NEXT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH BUSINESS IN ORDER UNDER THE CALENDAR WEDNESDAY RULE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule on Wednesday next be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE JOHN MCCORMACK, SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include therewith a very fine tribute paid to the distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives by National Commander Galbraith of the American Legion in his introductory remarks last evening, and the great speech which the distinguished Speaker made in response thereto.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives and all its Members were delighted and honored by the great tribute which the American Legion paid our beloved Speaker in their annual banquet for Members of Congress last night. No one who ever received the American Legion Award for Distinguished Public Service, the highest honor offered by this great patriotic organization, was more deserving of the honor than our great Speaker, JOHN MCCORMACK. All those present appreciate the splendid and most appropriate tribute to the Speaker by William E. Galbraith, the national commander, during his introductory remarks.

The Speaker delivered in response one of the greatest speeches I have ever heard on the history of the defense efforts of this country.

I am honored to be able to insert in the RECORD both the introductory remarks of Commander Galbraith and the address of our Speaker, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK:

REMARKS OF WILLIAM E. GALBRAITH

We come to a moment in this annual banquet in honor of the Congress of the United States when it becomes our privilege and pleasure to pay a very special American Legion tribute to one of your number who has served his country with distinction and with honor for more years than The American Legion has been in existence.

We are not revealing any secrets by telling you that the Legion is preparing to observe its 50th anniversary, and that this gentle-

man's career of public service began back in his native Massachusetts before the Legion was born.

As a young attorney he served as a member of his state's constitutional convention, and starting in 1920 he served three years as a member of the Massachusetts House of Representatives and the next four years as a member of the State Senate.

He was elected to the 70th Congress to fill an unexpired term, and was elected to the office starting with the 71st Congress. He has been re-elected to every Congress for the next four decades, which brings us right up to today.

He is a man who believes, as do his fellow American Legionnaires, that weakness breeds aggression. He stood on this platform a year ago and cited the parallels between communist aggression in South Vietnam today and Hitler's rampage through Europe prior to World War II.

He is a man who believes, as do his fellow Legionnaires, that the struggle in Vietnam involves more than Vietnam itself, that it may well prevent a larger war, and that what we are doing there is in the best interest of the United States.

He advised us from this platform a year ago that if we should err, let it be on the side of firmness and strength and not from the side of weakness. He told us then that Americans must always see the reality of history in the making and take the path that leads to greatness.

This gentleman not only has seen much American history in the making, but he himself has had a hand and a voice in the making of that history. He was elected speaker of the second session of the Eighty-Seventh Congress, and has been re-elected to that position of great responsibility continuously since that time.

He not only has spoken of determination, of firmness and of strength in the defense of our form of government and freedoms we enjoy under it, but he has taken positive action in every legislative effort to strengthen the armed forces of the United States, and has acted affirmatively whenever the opportunity arose for the legislative process to strengthen the role of diplomacy as an effective instrument in the struggle for world peace.

The history of the Congress contains no finer record of support for legislation of importance to veterans than that of the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Honorable John W. McCormack, from the Ninth District of Massachusetts.

A lifetime member of The American Legion, Columbia Post No. 50, of Dorchester, Massachusetts, Speaker McCormack, will you please join me here at the rostrum sir.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of The American Legion may I say that it gives me a great deal of personal pride and pleasure to present to you the 1968 American Legion award for distinguished public service, as represented by this bronze scroll inscribed as follows:

"The American Legion Award for Distinguished Public Service—presented to John William McCormack—9th District, Massachusetts—Speaker of the United States House of Representatives—Soldier—Statesman, Patriot—in recognition of outstanding service to community, state and nation."

Our hearty congratulations sir.

SPEECH BY SPEAKER JOHN W. MCCORMACK

As we study the history of our country, in every conflict there were those who opposed both in public life and in private life, and who were vocal in their opposition.

Even the Revolutionary War found sharp division—with only one-half of the people of the 13 colonies supporting the war that secured our independence and gave you and me and millions of other Americans our country.

But the determination and sacrifices of those who believed in and fought for independence prevailed.

For example, a similar situation existed in the War of 1812—when the Hartford Convention advised States to resist conscription, at a time when a British Army was at the gates of New Orleans.

In the Mexican War the House voted 174 to 14—the Senate, 40 to 2 in support of the war. But as the war became prolonged, the mood changed. The Whig papers of those days told Mexico that "her case was just, that a majority of Americans detested the war, that our Treasury could not bear the cost, that our Government was incompetent, that our armies could not win the war, and that soon the administration would be rebuked, and its policies reversed."

Rejen, the Mexican leader, stated the key to his policy was the belief the American people would not continue to support the war. And so he held on.

In the Civil War early enthusiasm was followed by discouragement.

In 1864 a group of prominent Republicans organized a "Lincoln withdrawal" movement. A Confederate General wrote his wife:

"We learn from gentlemen recently from the North that the peace party is growing rapidly—That McClellan will be elected and that his election will bring peace, provided always that we continue to hold our own against the Yankee armies."

Lincoln's loudest critics were in the Halls of Congress. For example, the Detroit Free Press reported, "not a single Senator can be named as favorable to Lincoln's re-nomination for President."

But the fall of Atlanta brought about a powerful change of heart. The bandwagon for his re-election on the Union ticket started, and even his bitter critics of only a few months before, through an aroused public opinion, had to join in.

And we remember the difficulties that confronted President Wilson.

And when Franklin D. Roosevelt was trying to awaken our people to the potential dangers of Nazi arrogant aggression, he encountered bitter opposition. And 3 months before Pearl Harbor, an extension of the Selective Service Act, under my floor leadership, passed the House by only one vote.

And I have often wondered what would have happened to our country if it had failed to pass, with Pearl Harbor 3 months off.

And in Great Britain, in the 1930's Churchill, whose place in history is established, was like a "voice in the wilderness" warning his people that the appetite of the arrogant aggressor is never satisfied when it encounters weak opposition, and when appeasement failed, Britain in desperation looked to Churchill for leadership.

And if the period of the 1930's shows us anything, it is that weakness in leadership against the arrogant aggressor leads to appeasement and that appeasement is the road to widespread war. The real "war-mongers" in the 1930's were the appeasers—and peace will not come through appeasement.

And today in South Vietnam and Southeast Asia, the same basic challenge—arrogant aggression, exists. In the 1930's it was Nazism; today, it is international communism.

While in some respects, and of necessity, the tactics of communism have changed—such as resorting to "peaceful co-existence" and "wars of liberation" its evil intent and purpose of world domination exists just as strongly as 40 years ago. It is well to remind our people of this fact. For anyone who feels otherwise, is living in a "dream world of hope."

It is proper to "hope for the best" if we are prepared for the worst.

And if we are going to err—it is better that we err on the side of strength, than on the side of weakness.

Our policy in South Vietnam was started in President Eisenhower's administration,

followed by the late President John F. Kennedy, and adhered to by President Lyndon B. Johnson. Over 150 efforts to negotiate has been made by President Johnson with the enemy, backed by the support in weapons and money by the Soviet Union and Red China. The enemy absolutely refuses to negotiate.

Our country is willing to negotiate for peace. Those voices who call for negotiation should address themselves to North Vietnam.

We hear the voices of some critics who advocate complete withdrawal. If that happened by default we would give communism its greatest world victory. It would result in America being alone in the world with the policy of "Fortress America" being forced upon us.

And the people of the free countries of Europe and elsewhere, instead of criticizing our country, should realize the future danger to themselves if by any remote chance that should happen. They should realize their own national interest is involved.

We have plenty of evidence that North Vietnam is an instrument of the furtherance of communism, particularly, in the immediate future, in southeast Asia. This is definitely set out by a recent statement of the General Secretary of the North Vietnam Communist Party, and I quote him:

"The theory and practice of the October revolution has helped the Vietnamese revolutionaries realize that national liberation might be linked to world proletarian revolution. The struggle of the Vietnamese people forms the spearhead of the world revolutionary tide."

The tragedy of the Nazi era of the 1930's is that Hitler told the world what he was going to do when he got in power in Germany, but few believed him.

The right of dissent is fundamental with our form of government.

But dissent should be responsible—not irresponsible. To every constitutional right there is the duty to express it in a responsible manner.

And not in a manner as recently stated by the commander of the North Vietnam forces, as constituting "an act of sympathy" to the North Vietnamese. If I ever made any such statement that the enemy would consider "an act of sympathy" I would never forgive myself for the rest of my life.

There are those who advocate a conditional or unconditional cessation of bombing of military targets of North Vietnam. We have already had at least five such pauses—one for 37 days—which the enemy used to increase their forces and military strength in South Vietnam. And after each pause, the North Vietnamese and Vietcong were in a better position to inflict more casualties on our Americans and allies.

If they were to call upon the North Vietnamese to cease building up their military strength in South Vietnam during a pause, that would be one thing, but to advocate that we cease bombing, and permit the enemy to build up its strength, is illogical. It is unfair to our Americans and our allies who are doing the fighting, not the talking, who are making the sacrifices, and who are not Monday morning quarterbacks.

We cannot say too much for the bravery and the sacrifices of our boys and those of our allies who are serving and fighting. They know what is involved is a future world of peace. They sense the evil intent and purposes of international communism. They know that the moral obligations and solemn word of our country is involved. They know the national interest of our country and our Far Eastern defenses, are involved.

To those who continue to engage in any kind of dissent, responsible or irresponsible, at least they can do or say nothing that will increase the danger of our boys and our allies in South Vietnam.

That is the least they can do.

That is the least they should do.

U.S. SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the inequities in the U.S. Selective Service System verge on scandal.

There is a gross lack of uniform standards in our draft laws—laws that put some young men in the battlefields of Vietnam and leave others to their studies or their jobs. Arbitrary and unfair practices under these laws have been protested by our citizens, by our colleges, by our graduate schools, by our Armed Forces themselves.

A bill I joined in putting before the House yesterday—H.R. 15799—would carry out needed reforms in the Selective Service System. It would knit together into one uniform fabric the tangle of draft laws that has been accumulating over the past 18 years. It would establish just and workable standards for conscription and deferment.

This bill, aimed at implementing the major recommendations of last year's National Advisory Commission on Selective Service, is the House version of a measure Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY has introduced in the Senate. No one has worked harder than Senator KENNEDY in trying to eliminate the injustices and inequities in our draft laws. The bill he has drafted attacks these problems squarely.

An editorial published in today's New York Times commends Senator KENNEDY's bill and points out the need for it. With permission granted, I include this editorial in the RECORD at this point:

THE DRAFT SCANDAL

Any law that compels some men to sacrifice their freedom and even their lives in public service while others remain free to pursue normal lives is inherently unfair. But there is no excuse for a draft law that contains as many inequities as the one under which young Americans are now being called to military duty.

A national advisory commission that examined this nation's eighteen-year-old Selective Service System last year proposed sweeping reforms to make the draft more responsive both to national needs and personal rights. Congress chose to ignore these recommendations, although the distinguished members of the study group had unanimously supported them in almost every instance. Instead, the lawmakers passed an amended draft act that was even worse than the original in the opinion of many, including Burke Marshall, the commission's chairman.

The folly of such short-sighted, patchwork legislation has been glaringly revealed in the President's recent order for the drafting of graduate students. In an effort to eliminate one of the system's most blatant inequities, the Administration has only created fresh injustices; it has raised grave difficulties for the nation's institutions of higher education and probably for the armed services as well. Inequity has been compounded by the abolition of national standards for occupational deferments, leaving judgment to local boards, which are notoriously inconsistent in passing on such deferments.

With draft calls and casualty figures rising rapidly, total overhaul of Selective Service should become top priority business for Congress this year. Toward this end, Senator Edward M. Kennedy has introduced a comprehensive draft reform bill which intelligently encompasses the major recommendations of the advisory commission. It calls for such desirable changes as random selection by lottery, induction of the youngest first, administrative reorganization of the Selective Service System, mandatory national standards for classification and elimination of occupational deferments, except where the President may determine deferments are justified in the national interest. The Kennedy bill neatly reconciles the advisory board's split opinion on college deferments by allowing college students to postpone military service until after graduation in time of peace, but suspending such deferments when casualties reach a given point to insure that "all young men . . . serve as equals" in wartime.

Senator Kennedy also asks for a one-year study of the feasibility of creating an all-volunteer army and a National Service Corps, looking to the possible elimination of military conscription in the future—as former Vice President Nixon suggested yesterday.

Some consider it folly to expect Congress to act on a draft law in a national election year. That may be. But it would be even more foolish—and highly irresponsible—for Congress not to act now to correct Selective Service injustices that are rapidly becoming a national scandal. The Kennedy bill offers a sound basis for such corrective action.

THE BUDGET AND THE SST

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday of this week, 47 Members of the House minority proposed 23 specific areas in the budget where we could pare some \$6.5 billion to allow not only a \$4 billion decrease in nonessential expenditures, but to provide for the adoption of a \$2.5 billion package to alleviate the most urgent human needs in our country. I have joined in supporting the full proposal, but I intend to focus my remarks today on the recommendation that the Federal Government forgo at this time an investment in the development of the SST, other than the minimum needed for a modest program of research and development.

My present position remains essentially unchanged from a year ago when the House debated whether or not to commit additional funds to the SST in a time of serious fiscal crisis. That crisis has not abated. To the contrary, it has worsened and unless the current stopgap procedures proposed by the administration are replaced with significant corrective measures our fiscal situation will not improve appreciably. Add to the budgetary problem, the recent disclosures of technical difficulties in the development of the SST and a whole series of questions are raised which echo the principal one I asked last July and raise again today; namely, "not whether it should be built, but when."

Our current budgetary situation needs no lengthy review. Nor is it necessary to detail the budget priority problems we face with respect to Vietnam and the urban crisis. The point has been made most eloquently by others that our original forecasts about the cost of the conflict in Southeast Asia have been made obsolete by recent reverses and our renewed efforts to sustain such important redoubts as Khesanh. The same may be said with respect to our major urban problems. The President's proposed expenditures pale beside the anticipated expenditures this Congress might authorize if the report of the National Commission on Civil Disorders were to be adopted as our blueprint.

Our financial situation alone adds poignancy to the question of whether there is any need for haste in the development of second generation or mach III supersonic commercial aircraft when the first generation or mach II supersonics have yet to be completed and improvements and size modifications in the current stage of subsonic jets offer us an excellent opportunity to buy time. In fact, a host of arguments together with technical difficulties in the development of the SST make its postponement an attractive idea, as well as a budgetary necessity.

The discussion about prestige and a possible loss of sales to a British-French Concorde overlooks the fact that the Concorde is an entirely different plane, constructed of aluminum for mach II speeds, and capable of carrying only 150 persons compared with the titanium SST, built for mach III speeds to ferry 350 or more passengers. Nor does the American aviation industry seem to recall the two instances when the British allegedly surpassed us with the Viscount and Comet, only to lose to our technically superior planes when they came off the assembly line a year or two later.

One also wonders how much competition the Concorde will offer when pitted against the Boeing 747 jumbo jet and the various airbuses that will be in use a year or two before the Concorde is available. The jumbo jets will provide inexpensive travel for 275 to 400 passengers. The argument that air travelers will prefer the Concorde to the jet in the same way they choose the jet over the prop plane overlooks several distinct differences. The prop plane took 10 hours to fly nonstop New York to London in cramped quarters with no television or other amenities. Compared to the 4-hour jet, the change was a significant improvement. But, many in the industry doubt whether the average vacationer will pay the extra high premium to cut 2 hours flying time when the faster plane is no more comfortable than today's jumbo jet. While 60 percent or more of the passengers cross country are businessmen traveling by air because of a desire to save time, 60 to 70 percent of the intercontinental travel, for which the SST will be built, consists of vacationers who are likely to prefer to get to Europe 2 hours later and use the money saved to stay 2 weeks longer.

Many in the industry suggest that the airlines themselves would be better off

with a protracted timetable and are aware of this. Under current schedules the jumbo jets will be ready in early 1971, the Concorde in 1972, and the SST in 1975. The Boeing 747 will cost around \$20 million each, the Concorde around \$30 million, and the SST about \$40 million. The airlines may have orders in for each, but in reality many of them are wondering where the capital is going to come from to invest in so much new equipment in such a short span of time. Last year the airlines by and large scored record profits, which can be attributed to the fact that the equipment they purchased a few years ago had begun to pay for itself. Even before the latest market downturn, airline stocks had begun to drop, leading analysts to believe that investors foresaw lower profits due to the projected purchase of new equipment. The point is, I believe, that the delay of the SST would neither hurt competitive sales with the first generation Concorde nor be unwelcome economically to the airlines.

Finally, there are important design problems which argue for a go-slow approach. This point is well substantiated in an article by the aviation writer for the Newhouse News Syndicate, William E. Howard. Mr. Howard's report which appeared in the March 3 issue of the Newark Star-Ledger points out there are significant flaws in the SST's basic design. Major questions concerning the plane's reliability and safety remain unanswered, such as maintaining cabin air pressure at 70,000 feet where a failure would mean instant death, and protecting passengers from the radiation caused by sudden solar flares. The weight of the plane offers many difficulties to be overcome, not the least of which is the fact that the heavier the plane the more thunderous the sonic boom.

Mr. Howard points out that the SST development director, Maj. Gen. Jewell Maxwell, thinks that the sonic boom is only "psychological." Evidently, the general has not read the mail from citizens who live under the flight path of the jets as they land and take off. In anguish and anger they suggest that unless the Congress legislate some sanctuary against the mounting decibels, they will be in need of a permanent asylum. The SST will multiply this mounting chaos fivefold.

I fully expect an American SST to be built with the assistance, to some degree, of Federal funds. But, the haste that caused the death of three astronauts is too fresh a memory to all of us not to heed the suggestion that a go-slow approach to the development of the SST would probably be beneficial in the long run. In weighing that decision, I invite Members to read Mr. Howard's article which I insert in the Record at this point:

OUR COSTLY, COMPLEX SST MAY NEVER LEAVE GROUND

(By William E. Howard)

WASHINGTON.—America's sleek supersonic transport has just taken off on its inaugural commercial flight. It is barreling along at 30 miles per minute, 60,000 feet up when one of the stewardesses plugs in a coffee maker. There is an explosive roar of rockets.

Someone has fouled up the wiring. Instead of firing up the coffee, the stewardess inadvertently has touched off four large rockets attached to the plane's belly. The rockets are there for an emergency in case one of the regular jet engines fall on takeoff.

But now the plane is extremely high and the enormous power of the rockets push it higher and higher—out of the atmosphere and into orbit where all aboard quickly die.

This disastrous end to the SST's first flight was envisioned more than two years ago by a Delta Air Lines pilot, Captain Paul W. Bennett, in a piece of fiction he wrote for his union's magazine. Bennett's main point:

"Man is not perfect. And he has never built a perfect machine. And although this one was equipped with the most sophisticated systems protected by ultrasophisticated protective systems, there was a flaw."

BIG QUESTION

Today, Bennett rates as something of a prophet, only a little far out, for there is a big question whether the nation's real super-sonic transport will ever fly.

Major flaws have cropped up in the plane's basic design—flaws so serious there is grave doubt they can be corrected.

Moreover, political opposition is growing to the huge craft's cost, to its specialized use for the "jet set," to its expected noise and to its irritating sonic boom that will crack along the ground like thunder if it flies overland.

The combination of problems—technical and political—prompted the government a few days ago to order a year-long slowdown.

This will set back the first test flight of the plane until 1972 or later and its introduction into regular airline service back to 1976 or 1977.

THE 4-YEAR LAG

Sales of production models are expected to be hurt since the new timetable will put the American SST more than four years behind a competing plane, the Concorde, being built jointly by the French and British. The Concorde has run into technical problems, too, but the first test model is now scheduled to fly in April—a date subject to more postponements and start carrying passengers in 1972.

Major General Jewell C. Maxwell, SST development director for the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), says reports the slowdown was inspired by pressure from Congressional economizers are "sheer baloney." However, he concedes the new timetable will permit a \$100 million reduction in the \$223 million sought for the project in the fiscal 1969 budget.

Some observers feel a revelation by the Boeing Co., prime contractor for the swing-wing B-2707, that it had run into severe design difficulties was a "fortuitous coincidence." It was a good excuse for program managers to order a delay and cut costs in the war-tight budget.

Maxwell, however, maintains the design problems are "fundamental" and has reservations they can be resolved in the plane's present configuration. "It's primarily a matter of air elasticity—the way the structure and the wings bend," he said in an interview. "We are getting adverse bending motions and we have had to add a lot more hydraulics to counteract them."

The extra hydraulics have added a lot of weight—so much that the B-2707 could carry only 100, instead of the prescribed 300 passengers, over the 4,600-mile range specification Boeing is obliged to meet.

"This is a serious matter," Maxwell said. "We can't satisfactorily solve the problem by the usual weight reduction methods. We have to go back to the drawing board."

NO. 1 ENEMY

The B-2707 already has spent a long time on the drawing board. Boeing officials say the

company first started designs for the plane in 1952 and has been at it in earnest for the past decade. Presumably, most of the problems had been licked by the time it won a lengthy competition for the contract, along with General Electric, maker of the jet engines, in December, 1966.

Now that more major changes are necessary, pilot Bennett's criticism is becoming all the more valid. Complexity has become the No. 1 enemy. The resources and wiles of aeronautical engineers are being stretched to the upper limit to create a machine that can be reliable and safe, and still fly in the thin upper atmosphere at 1,800 miles per hour.

Are they bumping against a technological ceiling? Some critics think so. They point out that with a nose to tail length of 318 feet, the B-2707 will be twice as long as a 707 jetliner; the takeoff weight of 675,000 pounds almost triple the 707's heft.

When booming along at 1,800 MPH the titanium alloy skin of the SST will heat up to a sizzling 450 degrees, hot enough to broil a steak. The plane will be so huge the pilot will be absolutely dependent upon electronics and hydraulic pumps to control it.

If the swing wing got stuck in its rearward fast-flight position, for example, they say the plane would have to land at 300 MPH—too hot for almost any airfield to handle.

What's more, passengers could face instant death at 70,000 feet if the cabin air pressure dropped to zero. They also could be exposed to dangerous radiation by a sudden solar flare at that height where there is little air to stop the rays.

SONIC BOOM

The biggest criticism, however, is against the sonic boom—a cone-shaped shock wave laid down by an airplane moving at three times the speed of sound. No way has been found to kill the boom, and none is in sight. It's a matter of physics. The shock wave is created by a body moving at supersonic speed because it piles up a ridge of air—compresses it. At lower speed the pressure ridge can't develop.

Extensive research has shown the heavier a plane is the louder boom it will lay down. Atmospheric conditions, the plane's maneuvers, the pressure of buildings on the ground and other conditions can either attenuate or intensify the boom's thunderous crack.

Maxwell, who produced the Air Force's first supersonic "dash" bomber, the B-58, has ready answers to most of these objections.

He says pilots like Delta's Bennett must learn "new ground rules" and with big, fast planes they "can't be hooked into the control surfaces anymore than the captain of the Queen Elizabeth." (The Boeing 2707, incidentally, doesn't have any emergency booster rockets yet, so an unexpected space flight isn't possible.)

STOP PROGRESS

Reliability in hydraulics and electronics "are a matter of fact today," he adds. "The people who want to stop the program," he said referring to Harvard physicist William A. Shurcliff, who heads the Citizens League Against the Sonic Boom, "want to cancel all progress for eons to come."

Acknowledging that all planes leak, he said there would be "no danger of fire" if jet fuel stored in the wings and fuselage came in contact with the 450-degree skin temperature. The fuel ignites at 600 to 700 degrees, he said.

Shurcliff and others are convinced that once an SST is flying, airlines will put it on overland routes. But Maxwell says the B-2707 is strictly an overwater carrier—a New York to Europe plane—"to meet the threat of the Concorde." He adds: "I don't know if we can fly any plane supersonically over land. The program was sold to Congress that way."

However, at the same time, Maxwell said he is convinced the SST will turn out to be

such a good thing that future models will eventually be used for short hauls, like a thousand miles, over land and will be built for that purpose.

He thinks the question of the boom as an annoyance "is mostly psychological—a question of getting used to it." Studies have shown in areas where fast military planes operate, residents and animals grow accustomed to frequent booms and pay them scant heed.

Around cities where there will be SST terminals, Maxwell points out, the planes will be coming in and taking off at subsonic speeds. "The boom will cut off 150 miles on either side of the airport," he says.

What does concern him, particularly at New York's John F. Kennedy Airport, is the noise to be generated by the B-2707's four 67,000-pound-thrust engines. "We hope to dump most of the noise on the airport with a relatively short takeoff," he said.

"Where the problem lies is in the sideline noise—the noise that spills off the sides of airport. It may be worse than today's jets—or it may be better in the range of 100 to 110 decibels at three miles."

JET SET TOY

The engine built by GE is scheduled to undergo its first ground test firings this month at Evandale, O., and this will reveal more about the noise characteristics.

Sen. William Proxmire (D-Wis.), an opponent of the government's proposed \$4.5 billion investment to get the first commercial SST's off the production line, has attacked the plane as "a toy for the international jet set."

Maxwell's reply is that airlines have taken over the transportation job from the railroads "and to say that only a favored few will ever use the SST is sheer baloney. Everybody uses planes these days."

The government is supposed to get its money back through a royalty on each plane sold. Limited to overwater flights, the FAA sees a total sale of 500 planes; unrestricted the number could rise to 1,200 by 1990 and create a \$40 billion international market that would greatly help to offset the balance of payments deficit.

NEW DELAY

But the new delay and growing uncertainty over whether the plane will be in fact successful for airlines has cast a dark cloud over these projections. Says Maxwell, "Sales will be hurt, but we still intend to come up with a better plane than the Concorde."

Russia is also building an SST—the TU 114 which is about the Concorde's size and speed (1,200 MPH)—but isn't considered much of a sales competitor.

The only ray of sunshine Maxwell sees among all the uncertainties is that the public appears unconcerned about the sonic boom and about making such a big leap to such an advanced high-speed plane. "We've gotten very little mail expressing complaints," says Maxwell.

The reason could be, on the other hand, that most people really don't care whether the giant ever flies or not.

PRESIDENT CALLS FOR ACTION ON INDIAN PROGRAMS

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson—the first Chief Executive in my memory to put an American In-

dian in charge of our Government's Indian programs—has just sent to the Congress an eloquent appeal for action to improve the quality and effectiveness of our efforts to provide full educational and economic opportunities to American Indians.

As representative of a district in which thousands of Indians live, I am deeply appreciative of the President's recognition of the need for action.

During the past few years, we have already seen a dramatic increase in vocational educational opportunity for adult Indians, and some major improvements in the general health and education programs. More than a dozen new clinics have been opened in eastern Oklahoma alone, during the past year, to make public health services available in Indian communities.

The President has correctly stated, however, that some Indian problems, "sharpened by years of defeat and exploitation, neglect, and inadequate effort, will take many years to overcome."

I am personally proud of the action taken to establish a National Council on Indian Opportunity, headed by the Vice President of the United States as Chairman, to assure consideration at the highest levels of government.

I am also very proud that the declared "new goal for Indian programs" will stress self-determination and promote "partnership self-help." I hope and trust that this Congress, which I have found to be deeply understanding and responsive in the field of Indian legislation, will prove both receptive and energetic in its response to the presidential message.

GREAT AMERICAN: HENRY HOLLAND BUCKMAN

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I learned today that one of America's great waterways leaders, Henry Holland Buckman, of Jacksonville, Fla., died on Wednesday.

Saddening to me, it is also to millions of others throughout our Nation who knew of and benefited from the good works of Mr. Buckman. He was a talented engineer, a warm human being, a gentleman with foresight who worked for the betterment of his fellow man, and one of my dearest friends.

His knowledge of the tremendous natural resources of our country and his goals for manmade projects to help advance our society are legend, and written in the far-reaching public works legislation enacted by Congress.

He served for many years and with distinction as president of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress. I am told that he was the only president of this 67-year-old organization who had not been a member of either the U.S. Senate or the House of Representatives, and he was president at his death.

His educational background was extensive. He was a graduate of Harvard and did postgraduate work at the Royal Technical College of Charlottenburg in Germany, the University of Berlin, and the University of Leipzig. Mr. Buckman was a senior corporate member of the American Society of Civil Engineers. He served in many areas of the Federal Government, including a time as technical counsel to the House Committee on Foreign Affairs and as engineering counsel for the Federal Civil Defense Administration. He was engineering counsel for the Canal Authority of the State of Florida, and was a prime mover in the construction of the Cross-Florida Barge Canal, which when completed will mean so much for our national defense and the economy of our Nation.

Henry Holland Buckman was a pioneer American who had the vision of a modern man. He leaves a vacuum in the progress of our Nation's waterways development, which we should strive to fill based on his monumental efforts for all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a resolution calling for the naming of a lock of the Cross-Florida Barge Canal in honor of Henry Holland Buckman. He was the canal's father confessor for four decades and he should be honored by this.

WHAT ETHICS?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I had hoped that the Bobby Baker case would have served as adequate warning to congressional employees that they should avoid the conflicts of interest inherent in seeking Government business loans or other Government decisions for their own benefit.

It is cause for great concern when it is discovered that the message did not get across in some Democrat political circles, and a number of public officials felt there was no impropriety in serving as officers and directors of firms seeking Government loans. The fact that the individuals involved severed their relations with the firms after questions of "conflicts of interests" were raised is little credit to the men involved.

I consider it unconscionable that one John J. Jabar, a congressional employee, was an officer and part owner of a firm that made application for Government loans. It is particularly shocking when it is noted that he was a kind of field representative for a congressional office with responsibility for helping citizens with their problems with Government programs.

Mr. Jabar, and some of his associates, also Government officials, severed their relationship with the controversial nursing home projects after questions of "conflicts of interest" were raised. However, the mere fact that they had initiated

ed these deals with the Government and then sold their interests to others is a demonstration of the total lack of sensitivity on ethical questions.

I think there is reason for grave concern when the ethical climate is such that these conditions exist:

First. Jabar, a \$10,000-a-year staff assistant in Congress, was president of a nursing home corporation that sought a \$415,000 loan guarantee from the Federal Housing Administration.

Second. Paul J. Mitchell, a \$12,500 a year local urban renewal authority director, was treasurer of the same nursing home corporation.

Third. Jerome H. Barnett, a \$15,000 a year Federal field coordinator for the Economic Development Administration, was president and director of a firm seeking a \$339,000 Small Business Administration loan on another nursing home project.

COLUMNIST ACCUSES CERTAIN REPUBLICAN MEMBERS IN THE NAMING OF CERTAIN VETERANS HOSPITAL FACILITIES

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, my attention has just been called to the syndicated column by Drew Pearson which appears in the press this morning. It names five Republican members of the House Committee on Rules and alleges in substance that they have bottled up a bill which would provide for the naming of five veterans hospitals, including one to be named for a former Member of this body, the late John Rankin, of Mississippi.

The column alleges that each of those named has refused to allow this bill to come to the floor under an open rule because to do so might permit the substitution of the name of Medgar Evers, for whom the hospital might be named if an amendment were adopted on the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to state publicly that the column is inaccurate insofar as I am concerned, and I, of course, presume to speak only for myself. I did oppose the granting of the rule as did a large majority of the committee, and I will continue to oppose the granting of rules naming veterans hospitals for Members of this body, living or dead. This has not been the practice followed in the past by the Veterans' Administration, and for that reason and that reason alone I voted against the granting of a rule for this bill.

MAN AGAINST MACHINE

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I recently received copies of correspondence between a gentleman in my district and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare which in a unique manner demonstrates the communication between man and machine.

In a refreshing display of independence from the growing maternalism of the Federal Government, Mr. Lehi M. Jones, a very respected and distinguished rancher from Cedar City, Utah, returned 22 unnegotiated social security checks totaling \$4,437 to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

In the accompanying letter addressed to former Secretary John Gardner, Mr. Jones stated:

It was never, nor is it now, my intention nor my desire to accept and use this money as represented by these checks. I am in good health and am able to carry on the small livestock operation I have been able to put together over the years since my discharge from the Army in 1919.

He went on to say:

I have attempted to find a worthy cause or some charity or a church into which I could direct the proceeds from these checks. So far I have been unable to think of any place which needs this money more than the U.S. Treasury in spite of the fact that our Government is mismanaging its money supply so badly and these dollars may be wasted.

And finally, Mr. Jones added:

The time may come when I cannot carry on and earn my own living as I am at present. If that time ever comes you may then receive an application for assistance from my wife and me. However, you can rest assured that before you receive such a request that all our assets will have been exhausted even to the point of finding that none of our five married children are willing or able to help.

The machine took little note of the unusual act of a concerned American, but then, a machine whose function is strictly mechanical cannot be expected to. The machine replied:

A formal waiver of benefits is, in many cases, the best means of accomplishing the purpose you desire. Therefore, we will be in touch with you again as soon as possible regarding this procedure.

The correspondence is as follows with an introductory letter from Kerry Jones, son of Lehi Jones, the writer:

JONES EQUIPMENT CO.,
Cedar City, Utah, March 3, 1968.
Representative SHERM LLOYD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SHERM: Although I am passing this on to you without his knowledge or his consent, I thought you might be interested in receiving a copy of a letter my father wrote to the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and to a copy of the reply he has received.

I certainly do stick with you in your concern about the fading of our Republic and the shifting to that of a welfare state. This bland, don't-rock-the-boat reply from a department head adds greatly to my concern.

Yours Sincerely,

KERRY JONES.

CXIV—361—Part 5

CEDAR CITY, UTAH,
January 22, 1968.

Dr. JOHN GARDNER,
Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am aware that this letter may be rather different and out of the ordinary when compared to the type you receive from day to day. However, over the past two years I have been receiving Social Security checks from your department each month. They remain uncashed and the total value is now quite substantial.

It was never, nor is it now, my intention nor my desire to accept and use this money as represented by these checks. I am in good health and am able to carry on the small livestock operation I have been able to put together over the years since my discharge from the Army in 1919.

You may wonder just why I have not made my feelings known before now. I have wondered the same thing. But, during the last two years I have attempted to rationalize my attitude. I have attempted to find a worthy cause or some charity or a church into which I could direct the proceeds from these checks. So far I have been unable to think of any place which needs this money more than the U.S. Treasury in spite of the fact that our government is mismanaging its money supply so badly and these dollars may be wasted. I am, however, returning to you about 20 checks which add up to a total of \$4,437.00.

The time may come when I cannot carry on and earn my own living as I am at present. If that time ever comes you may then receive an application for assistance from my wife and me. However, you can rest assured that before you receive such a request that all our assets will have been exhausted even to the point of finding that none of our five married children are willing or able to help.

Very Sincerely,

LEHI M. JONES.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION,
Baltimore, Md., February 29, 1968.
Mr. LEHI M. JONES,
Cedar City, Utah.

DEAR MR. JONES: This is in reply to your letter of January 22 to Secretary Gardner in which you returned 22 unnegotiated social security checks representing \$4,437 in benefits.

We have requested the San Francisco Payment Center to stop payment to you effective with benefits for the month of February, payable March 2, 1968. We regret that we did not receive your letter in time to stop your benefit check for January.

A formal waiver of benefits is, in many cases, the best means of accomplishing the purpose you desire. Therefore, we will be in touch with you again as soon as possible regarding this procedure.

Sincerely,

Director, Bureau of Retirement and Survivors Insurance.

STANDARD METROPOLITAN STATISTICAL AREAS HELP THE STATES TO HELP THEMSELVES

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, there is an old aphorism with which few could quarrel, that "them that has, gets; them that needs, waits."

To the larger communities gravitate the more prestigious and affluent industries; the universities, the thinkers and scholars, the persons who are needed most by the smaller communities, if they are to strive successfully to attain the dimensions enjoyed by larger metropolitan areas.

Industry and jobs, population and affluence, are synonymous in our society.

When industry considers moving into a community it seeks naturally to base its decision upon a sensible comparison of meaningful data on the area, its people and its potential, and the data must be presented in the same form as comparable data for other communities.

Since 1949, one of the standards for the uniformity of such presentations has been the standard metropolitan statistical area designation sponsored by the Bureau of the Budget in conjunction with the Census Bureau.

The general concept of the standard metropolitan statistical area is that of an integrated economic unit having as its nucleus a city or two contiguous cities above 50,000 in population with a large volume of daily travel and communication between the central city and other parts of that area. Except for the New England States the county is the basic SMSA unit. The city, or contiguous cities, form the heart.

Only three States of the 50 contain no standard metropolitan statistical areas. They are my State of Wyoming, Vermont, and Alaska.

On behalf of myself, and my friends and colleagues, the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. POLLOCK] and the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. STAFFORD], I introduce today a resolution which would express the sense of the House of Representatives that the Budget Bureau designate in each of these three States at least one standard metropolitan statistical area comprised of the largest city or cities together with such parts of the immediate environs as the Bureau of the Budget may deem appropriate.

This resolution is phrased so that it will not set a precedent for arbitrary demands by States already having SMSA's.

The resolution would have the practical effect of authorizing the Budget Bureau to heed Emerson's advice, that "no virtue goes with size," and disregard for Wyoming, Vermont, and Alaska the SMSA requirement of a central city of no less than 50,000 population.

In Wyoming, two cities, Cheyenne and Casper, come very close to meeting this criterion. They are the largest of Wyoming's cities. Casper is centrally located and is what we call the "oil capital of the Rockies." Cheyenne is my State's capital city and, although not located centrally, is a vital area for commerce, business, industry and, of course, the government of the Equality State.

Unfortunately, the last official census taken in 1960 does not give either city the 50,000 benchmark. For this reason more than any other, Wyoming has no

standard metropolitan statistical area. Accordingly, Wyoming is denied the industry-inducing status and prestige of designation in Federal publications which are reserved exclusively for information on the favored areas.

I can speak only for Wyoming but I believe that in Vermont and Alaska the appeal to industry would be much better buttressed if there were SMSA designations for at least one city in each State.

The cost to the Federal Government in this respect would be negligible; limited to the calculation and presentation of the statistical information already available for other standard metropolitan statistical areas.

Many benefits would accrue to Wyoming, Alaska, and Vermont by having at least one standard metropolitan statistical area.

As the Budget Bureau acknowledges:

Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area definitions are used in presenting data from the censuses of business, manufacturers, and mineral industries; the census of population and housing; and the census of governments; in presenting current economic and social data; and in analysis of local area problems. And, the data are used in many market analyses.

The resolution I introduce today points out that some of the Nation's 231 SMSA's are composed of population areas more than double the minimum population criterion. This, to my mind, indicates that population alone is more a benchmark than a necessity for the effective functioning for the SMSA concept.

The 1960 U.S. census lists Cheyenne, Wyo., as 43,505 and Casper as 38,930. The Rand McNally Atlas gives an estimated 1965 population for Cheyenne of 50,000 and for Casper 42,500. Any way the pie is cut, it would appear that both Cheyenne and Casper are very close to meeting the minimum standards.

Cheyenne in particular, through her chamber of commerce, has fought a valiant but heretofore unsuccessful struggle to achieve SMSA designation.

I have in my office a 3-inch-thick file of correspondence relating to Cheyenne's endeavors. Although I would not presume to dictate to the Budget Bureau which area in Wyoming would be first selected as an SMSA were my resolution to be adopted, I would think it probable that Cheyenne, as the larger area, would be the first to be considered.

If the Budget Bureau sought contiguous counties, it could select Albany County, which has the university city of Laramie, or Goshen or Platte Counties to the north. Officials of the Budget Bureau, particularly Mr. Walter F. Ryan, have been very helpful in responding to my efforts to find a solution for Wyoming in general and Cheyenne in particular.

It should be noted that there is no Federal law binding the Budget Bureau to its SMSA standards. The Budget Bureau does not want to break new ground by deviating from its published standards but it could do so if it were presented with the affirmative thinking

of the Congress in this matter as expressed through a House resolution.

I am hopeful that Congress will act quickly on this resolution so that Wyoming, Vermont, and Alaska will gain the advantages of having within their borders standard metropolitan statistical areas.

As Huxley observed, "size is not grandeur, and territory does not make a nation."

So that the record on this matter may be complete, I insert in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks an explanatory paper prepared in April of 1967 by the Budget Bureau and a letter to me dated November 27, 1967, from Walter F. Ryan, Chairman of the Federal Committee on Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas, along with the text of the resolution:

H. RES. 1089

Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the establishment of at least one Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area in each State

Whereas Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas are among the statistical standards developed for use by Federal agencies in compiling and presenting statistical data on a comparable basis for general purpose use; and

Whereas under criteria developed under the sponsorship of the Bureau of the Budget, only Alaska, Vermont, and Wyoming do not have within their boundaries at least one Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area; and

Whereas the statistical data of Standard Metropolitan Statistical areas gathered by various Federal agencies are highly useful in the establishment of meaningful economic and industrial profiles of metropolitan areas; and

Whereas Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area definitions are used in presenting current economic and social data and in analyses of local area problems; and

Whereas Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas are frequently used as "market" areas by business and industry because they represent a uniform basis for presentation of statistics; and

Whereas some of the Nation's 231 Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas are composed of population areas more than double the minimum population listed in officially published criteria which indicates that population alone is more a benchmark than a prerequisite for the effective functioning of the Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area concept; and

Whereas the majority of the criteria other than minimum population of the central city in the Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area can be met by cities in the only three States not now having at least one Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area; and

Whereas the presence of a Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area in a State can be considered as helpful to the economic development of the State and region as well as the Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area itself: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that in any case in which any State of the United States does not have within its boundaries at least one Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area, under criteria used by the Bureau of the Budget in establishing any such Area, the Bureau of the Budget should establish within such State without delay at least one Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area comprised of the largest city or cities within such State, together with such part of the immediate en-

vironments of such city or cities as the Bureau of the Budget may deem appropriate.

BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,

Washington, D.C., November 27, 1967.

HON. WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HARRISON: This is in response to your letter of November 13, 1967, concerning the status of Cheyenne as the central city of a standard metropolitan statistical area in the state of Wyoming.

As you may know, "Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas" are among the statistical standards developed, under the sponsorship of the Bureau of the Budget, for use by Federal agencies compiling statistical data for general purpose use. As a result of the work of an interagency committee, some 231 areas have been identified to date and are now used by Federal agencies in presenting, on a comparable basis, statistics on population, industry, trade, current employment and payrolls, as well as analysis of local labor markets.

The general concept of a standard metropolitan statistical area is that of an integrated economic unit, having as its nucleus a city (or two contiguous cities) having a population of at least 50,000, with a large volume of daily travel and communication between the central city and other parts of the area. Specific criteria have been developed for use in applying this general concept to the definition of individual areas. The criteria used in establishing standard metropolitan statistical areas and a statement of objectives sought are set forth in the enclosure.

You will note that Criterion 1 requires each standard metropolitan statistical area to have at least one city having a population of at least 50,000, or two contiguous cities having a combined population of at least 50,000, the smaller of which must have a population of at least 15,000. On the basis of data from the 1960 Census of Population, Wyoming did not contain a city or cities meeting these requirements. Since only official Bureau of the Census population data are utilized in the application of this criterion, the current population of the incorporated city of Cheyenne could be determined on the basis of a special population census conducted by the Bureau of the Census at local expense, or in the event the city has made annexations of adjoining populated areas since 1960, the Bureau of the Census could determine the 1960 population of the city as now defined. Otherwise, the next regular source of population data will be the 1970 Census of Population taken as of April 1, 1970. At that time, determination would be made as to the eligibility of Cheyenne for designation as the central city of a standard metropolitan statistical area.

If local groups wish to explore further the feasibility of a special census of Cheyenne, we suggest that they get in touch with Mr. Ross Eckler, Director, Bureau of the Census, Washington, D.C., with respect to the possibilities and costs involved. We shall be glad to facilitate such consideration if desired.

We appreciate your interest in the status of Cheyenne as the central city of a standard metropolitan statistical area and will be glad to provide any additional information you may wish.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER F. RYAN,

Chairman, Federal Committee on Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas.

STANDARD METROPOLITAN STATISTICAL AREAS
"Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas" are among the statistical standards developed under the sponsorship of the Bureau of the Budget, for use by Federal agencies compiling

statistical data for general purpose use. As a result of the work of an interagency committee, 231 areas have been identified to date and are now used by Federal agencies in presenting, on a comparable basis, statistics on population, industry, trade, current employment and payrolls, as well as analyses of local labor markets.

Standard definitions of metropolitan statistical areas were first issued in 1949 for use in the 1950 Census of Population and Housing, and replaced four different sets of definitions then in use for various statistical series—"metropolitan districts," "metropolitan counties," "industrial areas," and "labor market areas." Because of the use of different definitions, it had not been possible to relate statistics on population, industrial production, labor force, and other series for an area, since each series included different territory.

The general concept of a standard metropolitan statistical area is that of an integrated economic unit, having as its nucleus a city (or two contiguous cities) above 50,000 in population, with a large volume of daily travel and communication between the central city and other parts of the area. Specific criteria have been developed for use in applying this general concept of the definition of individual areas.

The primary objective in establishing standard metropolitan statistical areas is to enable Federal statistical agencies to utilize the same boundaries in publishing statistical data useful for analyzing metropolitan problems. The county is the smallest unit for which most agencies provide data. Thus, the criteria used in establishing the existing standard metropolitan statistical areas call for the use, outside the New England areas, of whole counties in defining the standard areas for which data are presented. In New England, the town or city is the basic unit used. The combinations of counties (or of towns and cities in New England) in terms of the criteria used, provide the basis for defining, in a comparable manner, areas other than single counties or cities which constitute integrated economic and social units with a recognized large population nucleus about which it is useful to present statistics.

Standard metropolitan statistical area definitions are used in presenting data from the Censuses of Business, Manufactures, and Mineral Industries; the Census of Population and Housing; and the Census of Governments; in presenting current economic and social data; and in analyses of local area problems. Various other users have adopted these area definitions; sometimes the areas as defined may be only an approximation to the most useful definition for these other uses but are used because of practical convenience. For example, standard metropolitan statistical areas are not intended to be "market" areas, but are so used in much market analysis. Modification of definitions to adjust to special uses would prevent attainment of our primary objective of a uniform basis for presentation of statistics by Federal agencies.

CRITERIA

The definition of an individual standard metropolitan statistical area involves two considerations: first, a city or cities of specified population to constitute the central city and to identify the county in which it is located as the central county; and, second, economic and social relationships with contiguous counties¹ which are metropolitan in character, so that the periphery of the specific metropolitan area may be determined. Standard metropolitan statistical areas may

¹ A "contiguous" county either adjoins the county or counties containing the largest city in the area, or adjoins an intermediate county integrated with the central county. There is no limit to the number of tiers of outlying metropolitan counties so long as all other criteria are met.

cross State lines, if this is necessary in order to include qualified contiguous counties.

POPULATION CRITERIA

1. Each standard metropolitan statistical area must include at least:

(a) One city with 50,000 or more inhabitants, or

(b) Two cities having contiguous boundaries and constituting, for general economic and social purposes, a single community with a combined population of at least 50,000 the smaller of which must have a population of at least 15,000.

2. If two or more adjacent counties each have a city of 50,000 inhabitants or more (or twin cities under 1(b)) and the cities are within 20 miles of each other (city limits to city limits), they will be included in the same area unless there is definite evidence that the two cities are not economically and socially integrated.

CRITERIA OF METROPOLITAN CHARACTER

The criteria of metropolitan character relate primarily to the attributes of the county as a place of work or as a home for a concentration of nonagricultural workers. Specifically, these criteria are:

3. At least 75 percent of the labor force of the county must be in the nonagricultural labor force.²

4. In addition to criterion 3, the county must meet at least one of the following conditions.

(a) It must have 50 percent or more of its population living in contiguous minor civil divisions³ with a density of at least 150 persons per square mile, in an unbroken chain of minor civil divisions with such density radiating from a central city⁴ in the area.

(b) The number of nonagricultural workers employed in the county must equal at least 10 percent of the number of nonagricultural workers employed in the county containing the largest city in the area, or be the place of employment of 10,000 nonagricultural workers.

(c) The nonagricultural labor force living in the county must equal at least 10 percent of the number of the nonagricultural labor force living in the county containing the largest city in the area, or be the place of residence of a nonagricultural labor force of 10,000.

5. In New England, the city and town are administratively more important than the county, and data are compiled locally for such minor civil divisions. Here, towns and cities are the units used in defining standard metropolitan statistical areas. In New England, because smaller units are used and more restricted areas result, a population density criterion of at least 100 persons per square mile is used as the measure of metropolitan character.

CRITERIA OF INTEGRATION

The criteria of integration relate primarily to the extent of economic and social communication between the outlying counties and central county.

6. A county is regarded as integrated with the county or counties containing the central cities of the area if either of the following criteria are met:

² Nonagricultural labor force is defined as those employed in nonagricultural occupations those experienced unemployed whose last occupation was a nonagricultural occupation, members of the Armed Forces, and new workers.

³ A contiguous minor civil division either adjoins a central city in a standard metropolitan statistical area or adjoins an intermediate minor civil division of qualifying population density. There is no limit to the number of tiers of contiguous minor civil divisions so long as the minimum density requirement is met in each tier.

⁴ Central cities are those appearing in the standard metropolitan statistical area title.

(a) If 15 percent of the workers living in the county work in the county or counties containing central cities of the area, or

(b) If 25 percent of those working in the county live in the county or counties containing central cities of the area.

AREA TITLES

7. The following general guidelines are used for determining titles for standard metropolitan statistical areas:

(a) The name of the standard metropolitan statistical area is that of the largest city.

(b) The addition of up to two city names may be made in the area title, on the basis and in the order of the following criteria:

(1) The additional city or cities have at least 250,000 inhabitants.

(2) The additional city or cities have a population of one-third or more than that of the largest city and a minimum population of 25,000, except that both city names are used in those instances where cities qualify under criterion 1(b).

(c) In addition to city names, the area titles will contain the name of the State or States included in the area.

DATA SOURCES

The definitions and titles of standard metropolitan statistical areas are established by the Bureau of the Budget with the advice of the Federal Committee on Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas. This Committee is composed of representatives of the major statistical agencies of the Federal Government. In applying the foregoing criteria, data from the following sources are used by the Committee:

Population, labor force, density, and occupational data: Bureau of the Census and Bureau of Employment Security.

Employment by place of work: Department of Labor, Department of Defense, Civil Service Commission, and the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

Volume of commuting: Bureau of the Census and Bureau of Employment Security.

BETTER ENFORCEMENT OF EXISTING LAWS THE KEY TO REDUCING CRIME AND DISORDER

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that many Members of the House were appalled at the report of the Presidential Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders which blamed everyone for the riots except those directly involved. It has been said:

To excuse a people for their own acts of violence and to exempt individuals from responsibility for the sins they commit ascribes to them an inferiority which is most destructive.

And this, Mr. Speaker, was said by Dr. Joseph H. Jackson, Negro president of the National Baptist Convention.

I believe also that the leniency of the courts in dealing with apparent lawbreakers, the decisions which favor the accused rather than protect society, and the failure of the Department of Justice to prosecute the agitators who travel throughout the country encouraging crime and civil disorders play an important part in the disorder which exists in our society today.

Teachers from the District of Columbia are here today lobbying among Members of Congress for pay raises, and I have assured the group that came by my office that I favor pay raises inasmuch as we have increased the salaries of both civilian and military Government employees. It seems only reasonable, Mr. Speaker, that these benefits should be extended to the teachers in our Capital. However, I believe they are doing a disservice to their profession by leaving the classrooms in such numbers and I told them that in the event they create any disturbance on Capitol Hill, my vote would be against any pay raise at this time. Teachers should set an example in good citizenship to the children they teach.

In a recent poll of all the homes in my congressional district, with more than 544,000 people, we found that 96 percent of the citizens responding to the questionnaire believe that better enforcement of existing laws is the key to reducing crime and disorders in the country. I believe every Member of this House would agree that there is no justification for government at any level discriminating against any citizen, and that all must have equal opportunity to share in the good things of life. But every citizen at one time or another is depressed and frustrated, and we cannot permit burning and looting as a relief for tension and frustrations. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, each individual and family should be encouraged to develop a system of discipline and those who deliberately inflame their audiences should be prosecuted.

We, in the Congress, Mr. Speaker, have an obligation to enact such laws and to promote such constitutional amendments as may be necessary to assure that this country is governed by the rule of law. I am including a copy of this month's newsletter to the people of the Eighth District of Virginia and the results of my questionnaire sent to more than 154,000 homes in the district. The 20-percent response we received from our constituents is most encouraging.

The newsletter referred to follows:

**YOUR CONGRESSMAN BILL SCOTT REPORTS
CRIME AND DISORDERS**

You probably know that the report of the Presidential Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders was filed March 3. This report is in 6 volumes and contains approximately 1500 pages. It places the blame for civil disorders on almost everyone but the rioters and suggests that white racism, lack of opportunity and frustration on the part of the black people are responsible for the riots. According to the report, young people between the ages of 15 and 25 predominate among the rioters.

Among the recommendations of the Commission for solution of the problem are open housing, removal of low and moderate income housing projects from the ghetto areas, development of systems of income and rent supplements, greater support for the education of both youth and adults, elimination of de facto segregation and elimination of hard-core unemployment. The cost of the programs is not indicated in the report but has been estimated at approximately the same as the Viet Nam War, \$25 billion—\$30 billion per year. Frankly, I cannot conceive of Congress enacting these recommendations.

Certainly our country is not perfect, and Winston Churchill once said that "Democracy is the worst form of government except all those other forms that have been tried from time to time." Most would agree that there is no justification for government, at any level, to discriminate against any of our citizens and that all must have equal opportunity to share in the good things of life. I wonder, however, if the publicity from the news media and the suggested justifications in statements by some of our public officials have not played a motivating role in the riots and violence and if the President's report actually will be helpful in solving our problems of crime and rioting. Is there a person who has not at times been depressed and frustrated? Can we at any time justify burning and looting as a relief for tension and frustrations? In my opinion, each individual and family should be encouraged to develop a system of discipline and those who deliberately inflame their audiences should be prosecuted. Furthermore, I believe the government should preserve law and order under all circumstances. We think of this country as one of law, but a study in two large cities indicates that because of fear of crime: (a) 43% of the people stay off streets at night, (b) 35% do not speak to

strangers, (c) 21% use cars and cabs at night, (d) 20% would like to move to another neighborhood, (e) 28% of the people keep watchdogs, and (f) One-third of the people keep firearms.

A full report of your answers to my recent opinion poll is on the back of this newsletter. You will note that more people of the District are concerned about enforcement of existing laws to reduce crime and disorder than any other question. 29,484 of you, or 96% said we should have better enforcement of existing laws; although 768, or somewhat under 3%, said No; and 468, or somewhat over 1%, had no opinion.

In view of the concern you and most people of the country have regarding crime and disorders, my staff and I will be spending a considerable portion of our time during the next month looking into possible ways we can suggest to the Congress and to others to find solutions to reduce the problems of crime. Our Sub-Committee on Census and Statistics is presently holding hearings on criminal statistics which may be helpful.

Many feel that the recent decisions of the Supreme Court favor the individual accused of crime and do not give proper consideration to the protection of society. It may be that limitations should be put upon the court's jurisdiction, that the terms of the Justices should be reduced to a period of years or that the Congress should provide guidelines in the criminal field for the benefit of the court. Certainly the laws should be enforced at all levels of government, and citizens should insist on this being done within the Executive Branch. We will keep you advised of our progress and welcome your suggestions.

AUTO THEFT PREVENTION

The House passed by voice vote a bill to prevent master keys to automobile ignitions from being sold by mail orders and being transmitted through the mail except to automobile dealers, locksmiths and others with a legitimate reason to unlock the ignition to someone else's automobile. I was one of a number of Members of the House to introduce this legislation. In view of the increase in crime in the country, it seems desirable to prevent the sale and mailing of keys which permit people with criminal intentions to have ready access to anyone's automobile. Certainly, it is to be hoped that the Senate will act favorably and that this legislation will help to control automobile thefts.

OPINION POLL RESULTS

While we will be glad for anyone to still send in his questionnaire, the results of those received are set forth below in percentage.

	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
1. Which of the following fiscal policies should the U.S. follow?			
(a) Impose a surtax on income.....	29	66	5
(b) Reduce appropriations for existing programs.....	76	19	5
(c) Postpone new domestic programs.....	70	25	5
(d) Encourage foreigners to visit the United States.....	75	15	10
(e) Limit American travel abroad.....	42	47	11
2. To reduce crime and disorder in our country do you favor:			
(a) Wiretapping in the investigation of organized crime.....	77	17	6
(b) Larger appropriations to slum areas.....	27	64	9
(c) Better enforcement of existing laws.....	96	3	1
(d) Additional criminal laws.....	68	22	10
(e) Government jobs for unemployed.....	22	68	10
3. Which of the following policies do you consider best in Vietnam?			
(a) Continue present policies.....	35	46	19
(b) Commit more troops.....	31	46	23
(c) Withdraw all troops.....	20	66	14
(d) Follow military advice.....	78	14	8
4. To deal with problem of ethics should Congressmen—			
(a) File duplicate income tax reports for public inspection.....	44	40	16
(b) File statements of assets and liabilities.....	66	22	12
(c) Existing laws sufficient.....	33	47	20

	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
5. Should the United States continue to trade with nations that are aiding North Vietnam?	22	72	6
6. Should the Constitution be amended to permit voluntary prayer and Bible reading in schools?	78	17	5
7. Do you favor a tax credit for small political campaign contributions?	37	56	7
8. Do you favor celebrating all national holidays on Friday or Monday?	44	48	8
9. Concerning proposed development of the Potomac River Basin, do you favor—			
(a) Tax incentives to reduce pollution.....	59	27	14
(b) Establishing a Federal agency to review land use.....	29	54	17
(c) Use all undeveloped river frontage for parks and recreation.....	42	44	14
(d) Parks at selected spots.....	75	12	13
(e) Scenic parkways.....	71	14	15
10. Do you favor using a portion of Bull Run National Battlefield for a veterans cemetery?	72	12	16

The past month has been a busy one, but it has been wonderful to hear from more than 30,000 homes in the District and to receive several thousand letters supplementing your answers. Please understand that the volume of mail has slowed our replies to correspondence, but we have now almost eliminated the backlog. So, if in the future you fail to receive a reply to any correspondence within a reasonable time, let us know and we will expedite the matter.

WASHINGTON AREA PARKING

The District of Columbia Committee has under consideration a number of bills to relieve what one might call a parking paralysis in Washington. This problem is one that affects commuters daily and in an appearance before the Committee I suggested that the Federal government has a responsibility to provide additional parking facilities for its employees. Certainly private industry should do its share in solving this problem, but I do feel that the Federal government can do more than it is now doing to provide parking spaces for its own workers. One suggestion to the Committee was that it look into the possibility of parking under the Mall. The Chairman of the full Committee later said he personally favored this, and I certainly hope it ultimately will be accomplished. Something clearly must be done about parking, not only for the daily commuter but to accommodate the thousands of visitors to our Nation's Capital.

SOMETHING TO PONDER

Lincoln was not great because he was born in a log cabin but because he got out of it.

THE PRESIDENT'S HOUSING BILL, OR, HOW TO SUCCEED IN POLITICS WITHOUT REALLY TRYING

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, the flow of congressional ideas on the urban crisis, on the problems of jobs, housing, community involvement, financing and the like, reached unprecedented heights in the first session of the 90th Congress. One of these proposals, for example, introduced by Senator CHARLES PERCY and me and cosponsored by more than 150 Members of both the Senate and House, sought to establish a public-private corporation to assist in bringing homeownership to lower income families. Other Members sought by means of tax advantages to attract industry into the ghetto or to stimulate rehabilitation of housing.

In fact, so varied were these proposals, that the rumor of the administration intent to submit a major housing and development bill in the second session left many wondering what could possibly be in it? This enigma was deepened by the hostile reaction from administration officials directed at any and all legislative ideas originating, Heaven forbid, from the legislative bodies.

Now the secret is out. If the ideas contained in the President's housing bill seem familiar, at least in their general outlines and goals, it is because they are familiar. Read last year's RECORD and compare, those of you who doubt it. The

bill is the climax to an ingenious political plan designed to save time and administrative mental anguish, a plan which is outlined in some detail in an article on political one-upmanship written by the Wall Street Journal's Monroe Karmin and entitled, "Follow the Leader" as Played by L. B. J. I include the article from the Journal of March 7, 1968, at this point, so that my colleagues can learn how to succeed in politics without really trying. Those members of the American public who have had to spend an additional year without adequate shelter, or jobs, or hope, may be less amused.

The article follows:

"FOLLOW THE LEADER" AS PLAYED BY L. B. J.
(By Monroe W. Karmin)

WASHINGTON.—President Johnson's latest pronouncement on "The Crisis of the Cities" is exemplary instruction in the art of political one-upmanship.

The LBJ Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 is less a blueprint of fresh initiatives to remedy urban ills than an attempt to gain the upper hand over Congress without seeming to be really trying.

Mr. Johnson's Capitol Hill adversaries are those Congressmen who have embarrassed him either by rushing to the head of the parade in the quest for new ideas or by evoking a sympathetic public response in opposing past Administration initiatives. They fall into three categories:

Upstart Republicans. As far back as 1966 Sen. Charles Percy of Illinois began talking up the virtues of subsidized home ownership for the poor. Urban Secretary Robert Weaver talked down the idea with passion and persistence. Now the Johnson Administration is proposing to help the poor own homes.

Audacious Democrats. For some time Sen. Robert Kennedy of New York has been advocating tax incentives to interest industry in the slums. Mr. Weaver and other LBJ aides resisted. Now the Administration is proposing a tax advantage to lure private capital into slum housing.

Neanderthal Conservatives of Both Parties. Of all the Great Society experiments, none has warmed the President's heart more than his plan to use tax money to help poor families pay their rent. A great many taxpayers, however, abhor the idea, and conservatives, though they failed to prevent enactment of the program, continue their attack. Now the Administration is proposing a new support for low-rent housing that could, eventually, replace rent supplements.

The President's motives are known only to him, but an inkling is revealed in his view of history. Mr. Johnson's latest urban message reminds Congress how the Federal Government over the years developed its response to city problems.

Back in 1937, as Mr. Johnson remembers, Franklin D. Roosevelt "saw a third of the nation ill-housed." So, "he and the 75th Congress" initiated the "historic" public housing program. Twelve years later, "President Truman and the 81st Congress" expanded upon the FDR initiative by pledging "a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family" and beginning urban renewal. Further enlargements of the Government's role in housing and urban development were accomplished by "President Eisenhower and the 83rd Congress" and by "President Kennedy and the 87th Congress."

Nevertheless, Mr. Johnson reminds the lawmakers, "when I became President" the Federal housing problems were still less than perfect, and over the past four years "you in the Congress have approved our proposals" for improvement.

It's clear from this recounting of events past that Mr. Johnson believes the President should propose and the Congress should ratify. But what does a President do when Congress jumps out ahead of him?

First, you demolish the Congressional initiative.

When Sen. Percy a year ago floated his ideas about home ownership for the poor, Urban Secretary Weaver rang the alarms: "A snare and a delusion and a cruel hoax." To promise the poor home ownership by subsidizing mortgage interest rates, Mr. Weaver warned, "is economically impossible, and I think it is terrifically dangerous because you are going to raise the hopes of all these people . . . who are already frustrated and disenchanted with the system under which they live."

HANDS OFF TAX LAWS

When Sen. Kennedy a year ago proposed tax advantages to attract private capital to slum housing, the Administration reacted similarly. Mr. Weaver branded the Kennedy plan "a significant backward step" because it proposed to restrict "a major housing aid program to the ghetto." And Joseph Barr, the Under Secretary of the Treasury, admonished the lawmakers to keep their hands off the tax laws: "We have consistently opposed the use of the tax code for narrow or specialized purposes."

That much accomplished, you next defend to the death your own programs.

When Sen. Kennedy persisted with his plan, Mr. Weaver argued that Johnsonian programs, with perhaps a bit of rejiggering, were quite capable of doing the job. Particularly, the Urban Secretary defended a pet program (called "221d3") that lowers rents for the poor by Federal National Mortgage Association purchases of mortgages. "Why create a whole new instrument," Mr. Weaver asked Sen. Kennedy, "if you can take an instrument you have and by a simple action make it as effective as the other one?"

When President Johnson finally won his rent supplement program over bitter Congressional opposition, he savored his victory. "I have never signed a bill which gives me more satisfaction," Mr. Johnson declared, "It represents everything I have believed in during all my 35 years in public office. It is a clear-eyed but compassionate solution to a pressing national problem."

Thus the 1967 record is set straight: The Johnson Administration opposes such upstart tomfoolery as subsidized home ownership for the poor and tax advantages to lure private capital to slum housing, and favors housing the poor by its own 221d3 and rent supplement programs.

Yet in 1968 you turn right around and propose as your own the very tomfoolery you were opposing a year ago. Mr. Johnson's 1968 Housing and Urban Development Act not only recommends subsidized home ownership for needy families but proposes to achieve the goal by the very method—a mortgage interest rate subsidy—that Mr. Weaver a year ago was calling "economically impossible" and "terrifically dangerous."

"Owning a home can increase responsibility and stake out a man's place in his community," the President declares. "The man who owns a home has something to be proud of and good reason to protect and preserve it."

"PASS-THROUGH" LOSSES

The President also apparently found some merit that escaped Mr. Weaver in the Kennedy plan to woo private capital to the slums. The 1968 Johnson legislation proposes a new national housing partnership between Government and industry that offers to industry partners, for tax purposes, the very same "pass-through" of early-year operating losses that was included among the tax advantages suggested by the junior Senator from New York.

Next, you quietly discard what you defended a year ago.

The President's message proposes a new interest rate subsidy program to produce more rental housing units for moderate income families. Mr. Weaver concedes it will replace the "221d3" program he championed so vigorously a year ago.

The same thing could happen, eventually, to the President's cherished rent supplement plan, though no one is conceding that yet. Neither Congress nor the voters back home have ever warmed to the idea, a fact not lost upon the Johnson Administration. So, while Mr. Johnson is proposing a rent supplement expansion, he clearly is not putting all his rental housing chips on supplements but, indeed, is doing what Mr. Weaver resisted a year ago—choosing "a wholly new instrument," the interest subsidy proposal. The Weaver team offers no explanation for this turnabout other than to admit the political unattractiveness of rent supplements.

And finally, having wrested away the upper hand, you beseech Congress to ratify your lead.

"To achieve our housing goal, we must move from low to high production," the President's message implores. "We can make that shift only if the challenge summons the commitment" of all segments of society but "most importantly, the Congress."

Now that you upstarts are back in your places, follow me.

ISRAEL AMBASSADOR SEEKS PEACE BETWEEN ARABS AND JEWS IN HIS MAIDEN SPEECH BEFORE THE NATIONAL PRESS CLUB

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to attend the luncheon held Wednesday noon at the National Press Club in Washington to hear a very profound address by His Excellency Maj. Gen. Yitzhak Rabin, Ambassador to the United States from the State of Israel. The Ambassador had just presented his credentials the day before and this was his maiden speech.

The general theme of the address was the willingness of the Israel Government to negotiate a peace settlement between the Arab Republic and the State of Israel, which would eradicate the animosity existing between the Arabs and the Jews.

I believe that his approach to this problem is sound.

The question and answer period, which was conducted by National Press Club President Allan Cromley, chief of the Washington bureau for the Daily Oklahoman and the Oklahoma City Times, was one of the most stimulating ones that I have ever heard. The questions were very penetrating and the Ambassador, who is a former major general, and in a great measure responsible for the Israel victory in the 6-day war, gave every indication that he is as equally qualified to pursue the cause of peace as he was in the cause of victory during the hostilities last June.

I recommend to all Members of the House that they read the complete text of Ambassador Rabin's address before

the National Press Club, which, under leave granted, I include, along with items which appeared in the Washington Post and the Washington Daily News today:

ADDRESS BY HIS EXCELLENCY THE AMBASSADOR OF ISRAEL, MAJ. GEN. YITZHAK RABIN, BEFORE THE NATIONAL PRESS CLUB, WASHINGTON, D.C., MARCH 6, 1968

I am very glad to have this opportunity of meeting the distinguished press corps of this Club, at a time when I am assuming my duties as my country's Ambassador to the United States.

Nine months have passed since the Six-Day War. Nine months is a considerable stretch of time, especially in the Middle East. Yet it cannot be said that its aftermath stands in any relation to the clear and decisive military victory of last June. The question that has no doubt been posed and will be posed is what has been achieved in the war, what has not been achieved, and what are the main problems confronting Israel today and tomorrow.

WHAT HAS BEEN ACHIEVED

First I should point out what is known as "before and after" in any war or confrontation. There is much wisdom in hindsight; since unhappily it is not possible to be one hundred percent wise in foresight.

The primary and major achievement of the war was the removal of the immediate threat to the very existence of the State of Israel and its people. In the latter part of May and early June 1967, we witnessed a determined attempt on the part of the Arab States to destroy Israel. We were faced with our most difficult political and military situation since 1948. The Six-Day War removed this immediate threat, but for how long cannot yet be said. This achievement would have been itself enough. But we have achieved much more than that. Some of our achievements can be seen with certainty, and others I am quite sure will emerge in future.

The obvious achievements are as follows: (1) The Arab armies threatening Israel were beaten, particularly that of Egypt, and to a lesser extent the Jordanian forces, and to a still lesser extent those of Syria. The Iraqi Air Force suffered a limited setback. The damage inflicted was for the most part on material such as aircraft, tanks, artillery, trucks, and military infrastructure, and to a more limited extent on manpower. In round figures, about 1,000 tanks were destroyed, 450 planes, some 1,400 artillery pieces of various kinds, and many thousands of vehicles. The Arab forces lost about 1½ billion dollars worth of equipment. This destruction was of major military significance during the war. The Arab armies ceased to be a factor capable of preventing further Israeli advance beyond the present cease-fire lines. However, today, nine months later, it can be said that massive Soviet aid has almost entirely replenished the Arab losses, in some cases with equipment of superior quality.

(2) The second achievement, I believe, will last longer than the first one. The Arab Armies suffered a major blow to their morale and self-confidence in waging a successful war against Israel on their own. It is very difficult to evaluate this kind of achievement. We have no way yet of quantifying psychological factors. However, we learned only before the last war the difference between Arab logic and our own. Moreover their own logic does not always dictate their actions. Emotional factors and mass hysteria characterized the events that led up to the Six-Day War, despite any logic or rational interests of the Arabs themselves. In my own view, the real recovery of the Arab forces and restoration of their confidence for another all-out war with us is not a matter of a few months, always assuming that they will think logically, and that we are concerned with an Arab-Israeli war, without any intervention on the part of a Great Power from outside our region.

(3) The third achievement is that of the major improvement in Israel's lines of defense, namely the current cease-fire lines. Israel holds territories greater in area than she did on June 4th, 1967, and despite that our border lines today are a great deal shorter than they were then. Moreover, they lie along natural and artificial obstacles which completely alter our defensive capacity in the event of a renewed attack. Our border with Egypt, for instance, was previously some 300 kilometers in length; today it is about a third of that. The previous border was entirely exposed to armored attack. Today it rests along a natural obstacle, if we can so call the Suez Canal. The Canal is 170-200 meters wide, and it should present a serious obstacle to the Egyptian army. Further, the over-all strategic picture has completely changed. The previous Israel-Egyptian border (I refer not to the Gaza Strip but to Sinai) was about 130 kilometers from Tel Aviv, with Cairo 350 kilometers away. Today it is quite the reverse, and this is of decisive significance for having a better warning against air attack. The picture has similarly changed in the vital part of our border with Jordan. The fact that the West Bank is under our control has cut the length of our border line by nearly one third; and that border line runs along the natural barrier of the Jordan River. This and the reunion of Jerusalem have removed the danger of shelling of our population concentrations in the heart of Jerusalem and along the coastal region. In the Syrian sector, too the constant threat to our border settlements is removed, and we enjoy defense in depth of decisive topographic significance.

WHAT HAS NOT BEEN ACHIEVED

It would not be appropriate to speak in terms of what we failed to achieve, for the simple reason that the war was not initiated by us. It was forced on us. It was not we who wanted it. Our major achievement of the war is no doubt that our enemy failed to achieve its aim. But it must be admitted that after it was over, we might well have thought that the very dimensions of their military defeat, the very extent of their collapse, evident as it was, would produce a change in Arab attitudes and policies toward us.

The Six-Day War might surely have demonstrated to the Arabs the futility of a continuation of their hostility and belligerency. Their vast efforts over a good number of years to create armed forces capable of destroying us had proven of no avail. They expended the best of their resources, in terms of wealth and manpower, on their armed forces, instead of on internal economic development. For all that, it was demonstrated that all our neighbors, in concert, were unable to defeat us, although we were on our own, with no outside help.

It might have been reasonable to expect that the complete failure of these Arab policies would bring some change, either in these policies or in their regimes. No one can say with certainty that this was the final war in the Arab-Israel conflict. The Six-Day War is over, but the Seventh Day, the Day of Rest, has not yet come to Israel.

We might ask ourselves why the war has not so far led to the logical abandonment of a policy of belligerency against Israel. For twenty years it has brought nothing but defeat and disaster upon the Arab world. There is no ready answer, but I would suggest two main reasons:

(1) The first is that the very hatred of Israel that the Arab leaders have nourished amongst their people has come to limit their own freedom of manoeuvre in view of considerations of their public opinion at home. Over the years they have utilized their public information media and their school system, right down to the kindergarten level, to promote and nourish this hatred of Israel. Military and totalitarian regimes do not change overnight. In the first place, it is

very difficult for the Arab States to rid themselves of a policy they have preached for many years. Since 1948 the Arab States have followed a consistent policy of active non-acceptance and non-recognition of Israel. Only special circumstances and a leader of courage and conviction are required to divert the Arab world from its present path and policy.

(2) I have no doubt that the Six-Day War can provide the basis and circumstances for such a change in Arab policies. Were the conflict insulated from certain other, outside factors, we might well have already been witness to such a change. But this unfortunately, has not happened, and the Arab States have more than a mere feeling that a Great Power is backing them up, and holding out hopes of their recovering what they lost in war, without budging from their basic policy towards Israel. Vast military and political support from the same Great Power is breathing new hope amongst some Arab leaders, and they believe that if they play their cards well, they need not abandon their policy of war. So far, President Nasser's most recent pronouncements to his people show no abatement in his belligerent attitude and objectives regarding Israel.

I doubt whether the Great Power would like to see a renewal of the war, particularly not in the immediate future. But I would say that she would not like to see a peace settlement and an end to the tensions in the region unless it be on her own terms. The continued tension and instability in the area was one of the factors which enabled her to establish herself in the Middle East, to extend her influence and establish a military presence in the area.

The Arab military defeat, especially that of Egypt, was a defeat for her, too. What was demonstrated was her failure to train an effective Egyptian Army, despite all the manifold efforts of the past thirteen years. And she, too, must surely be a little anxious that the Egyptians may draw certain conclusions about her failure to promote Egyptian policies successfully.

The two major obstacles to any fundamental change leading to normal Israel-Arab relations based upon peace and mutual respect are the psychological moment in any departure from the old emotional policies towards Israel, and the firm backing of the Great Power in question.

THE MAIN PROBLEMS FACING ISRAEL

Therefore the main problems facing Israel now, overriding any other problems, are as follows:

(a) To bring about a real change in the inter-relationships between the Arab countries and Israel, which means a real and lasting peace.

(b) Or as long as this goal has not been achieved, to prevent a renewal of the war.

We have the right to live our life in peace and security. I know that the Arab-Israeli conflict is not a simple one. But I am sure that all problems can be solved once the Arabs stop dreaming that it is possible to destroy Israel, accept Israel as a fact, recognize and live with her. Therefore we say to the Arabs now let's sit together and negotiate a peace settlement. We don't say that we are going to stay wherever we are now. We are ready within the framework of this kind of negotiation to come to an agreement on the recognized and secure boundaries of the future. But if you are not ready to talk peace with us, if you are not ready to abandon your policy of seeking Israel's destruction, why then do we have to withdraw even one inch? Just to hand you back the areas which served in the past and will serve in the future as a springboard for your aggression? Let us finish the state of war by establishing good and really friendly relations that will be of benefit for all our peoples.

We must strive towards a real peace but at the same time strengthen Israel's capability to prevent any attempt by the other side to return to the use of force. The stronger we are, the better are the prospects of achieving peace in the area. There is a famous saying to it takes two to make peace but only one to make war. We are ready for peace—we still lack the second partner to make it.

It might be that the road to peace will be long but there is no doubt in our minds that it can and will be achieved. We know that it will entail suffering and sacrifice for Israel, but we are sure that we have no other choice.

We hope that peace-loving countries will understand and support our efforts to achieve a real and lasting peace in the Middle East.

ISRAEL ENVOY TAKES HARD LINE ON TALKS (By Charles M. Roberts)

Israel's new ambassador to the United States took a hard position yesterday on the critical issue of face-to-face negotiations with the Arabs.

Maj. Gen. Yitzhak Rabin, a hero of the six-day war last June, told an overflow crowd at a National Press Club luncheon that he doubted that any "real results" could be achieved "unless the other side will be forced to talk with us."

If they do not agree to meet face-to-face, he added, it will mean the Arab states do not recognize Israel.

United Nations special emissary Gunnar Jarring, the Swedish ambassador in Moscow, has been working on a plan to have both sides meet with him, but not necessarily face-to-face, in his Cyprus headquarters. While there have been reports of agreement on this, American officials insist that is not yet so.

CAN HOLD PRESENT LINE

Rabin strongly suggested that Israeli forces will not withdraw "even one inch" unless the Arabs agree to "sit together and negotiate a peace settlement."

He added that Israel is able, from a military point of view, to hold its present cease-fire lines "two, five 10 or even 20 years."

"We are ready to wait," he said; "we are going to wait where we are until we achieve a peace."

Most of the harder aspects of the Israeli position came in reply to questions. His prepared address was not quite as tough in tone.

One point in the prepared address, however, backed up Rabin's remark about sitting it out for years, if necessary, on the present lines. He said that the war had reduced the size of the Israeli-Egyptian border that has to be defended from 300 kilometers (about 240 miles) to about a third of that, and that the Jordanian border likewise is now much shorter.

BETTER WARNING

Furthermore, said Rabin, the fact that the Egyptian border is now on the Suez Canal "is of decisive significance for having a better warning against air attack."

While the Soviets have "almost entirely replenished" Arab arms losses, said Rabin, recovery of Arab confidence for another all-out war "is not a matter of a few months." However, Soviet backing has bolstered Arab hopes, he said.

Rabin said Egypt's President Nasser has shown "no abatement in his belligerent attitude and objectives." In reply to a question, Rabin speculated that any change of government in Cairo would be "toward more freedom and a more democratic way of running Egypt."

The Ambassador, while deploring American arms aid to Jordan, said he had "no doubt" that it was better "to have someone other than the Russians in Jordan."

Rabin was highly complimentary to France because "we won the war with French planes." He said Israel now will "try every source" for new planes since "it doesn't seem that we're going to get" the planes ordered from France.

RABIN LEAVES THE DOOR AJAR (RING)

(By R. H. Boyce)

A statement here by Israel's new ambassador to the U.S. that Israel will not "stay forever where we are now" was intended to encourage Arabs to enter peace talks, U.S. diplomatic sources said today.

Remarks by Maj. Gen. Yitzhak Rabin at a National Press Club luncheon yesterday were viewed as the clearest statement yet of the Israeli position on withdrawal from Arab territories occupied since last June's six-day war. Gen. Rabin said:

"We say to the Arabs now, let's sit together and negotiate a peace settlement. We don't say that we are going to stay forever where we are now. We are ready within the framework of this kind of negotiations to come to an agreement on the recognized and secured boundaries of the future."

Egypt long has insisted that Israel must withdraw before negotiations could begin. Israel wants talks first to decide where the boundaries would be. But official Israeli public statements have not been clear because the Israel government is divided on territorial conditions.

Also, the two nations have differed on interpretation of a United Nations resolution of last Nov. 22 which called for Israeli withdrawal "from territories occupied" but carefully did not say "all" the territories. It also urged termination of states of belligerency, and acknowledgment of the rights of all Middle East states to live in peace "within secure and recognized boundaries."

Egypt has said it would negotiate if Israel would commit itself to the resolution, meaning withdrawal. Israel's acceptance of the resolution has been qualified.

Gen. Rabin, making his first public statement as Israeli envoy here, said:

"If you (Arabs) are not ready to talk peace with us, if you are not ready to abandon your policy of seeking Israel's destruction, why then do we have to withdraw even one inch, just to hand you back the areas which served in the past and will serve in the future as a springboard for your aggression?"

Gen. Rabin said the talks must be direct, "face to face," which has long been an Israeli condition. But he softened this by adding that "this might be in the presence of Jarring. Gunnar Jarring is a Swedish diplomat authorized by the UN to attempt to bring Israel and the Arabs together."

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TEACHERS STRIKE

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, today a group of Washington, D.C., teachers called at my office.

I was most unfavorably impressed. I am certain that this group of teachers did not accurately represent the total teacher corps of the District schools. If they were representative, our schools are in dire trouble.

These teachers would set poor examples for any student.

One had a fifth-grade boy with her—neither was well groomed. The boy's grammar was considerably below satisfactory. He had little respect for private, personal effects in my office. He spoke up in our conversation. His teacher-mother thought this was perfectly permissible because he "knew a good deal about this problem." He did not mind missing a day of school.

One teacher who claimed to be a teacher of congressional activities in her school, believed that few Congressmen worked from Friday to Tuesday.

Not one of them knew more than a modicum about the Congress.

They were not considerate enough to call or make arrangements for an appointment. They showed little consideration for my time even though they knew they were keeping me from attending a committee meeting.

They were not in the least concerned about the detriment to the students for missing a day's classroom instruction.

They were interested only in their own salary. None was able to tell me anything they had personally done or attempted to improve their situation or correct their grievances.

One told me that his principal and supervisor was incapable of evaluating his competence or merit for salary increase or promotion, yet implied that the Congress should have been able to do this long ago.

One called her principal a "little dictator," but conceded that she had done little to negotiate on a reasonable person-to-person basis any of her alleged grievances.

Everyone seemed to be wrong, misled, and hostile except the teachers who were on strike.

Of all the groups of workers in our society who should have the training, education, and experience to articulate and negotiate their grievances, the teachers should be in the vanguard and the most able.

Others without the training and experience in communication may be excused for their abandonment of reasonable negotiation and for their resort to strikes, but a teacher's main forte is communication. If they cannot communicate with their superiors, the School Board, the Congress without resorting to a disruption of their students education, how could we possibly expect them to communicate with their students. The District schoolchildren are in dire trouble if these teachers are representative of all teachers in the District.

One teacher said there was nothing wrong with her "taking leave" today. She had it coming; she could take it this way or on a beach somewhere. The welfare of her students meant very little to her.

All of the teachers were jealous of the firemen and policemen who had been able to convince the police commission and the Congress that they had earned a pay raise recently. None of them wanted to talk about their competence as a teacher. None of them thought their salary should be related to their classroom competence. All were satisfied to have all teachers earning the same pay regardless of competence—"just like

Members of Congress, good and bad, who all receive the same pay."

All used the strikes by teachers in Montgomery County, Florida, and elsewhere as justification for their strike.

All wanted to define their abandonment of their students and their failure to report for classroom work today as something different from a strike. This of course is a rather obvious hypocrisy—a bad example of integrity for students.

I believe teachers do not need to resort to strikes—they, of all working groups, should be able to present their views, if valid, in a reasonable, convincing manner.

When their strike adversely affected the education of one child, it was no longer justified. Strikes are unsatisfactory means of settling disputes. Strikes, like war, only indicate that the parties have failed. Strikes which are between two parties only are deplorable; but strikes which harm a third party—such as the public health and safety—are barbaric; strikes which harm an innocent student, particularly a student who so urgently needs a better education as the children of the District of Columbia, are despicable.

Prior to the miserable demonstration on Capitol Hill by the mob tactics of some teachers, I was inclined to be sympathetic to a pay raise for District teachers. Now, I believe that some are overpaid and should not be trusted with the enormous responsibility of teaching our children.

WHATEVER BECAME OF CARA?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include pertinent extraneous material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I think all Members of the Congress are interested in the procurement of big government, particularly since the budget involves the procurement of military equipment and supplies in that portion of over \$42 billion which annually goes for this purpose. I know the Committee on Armed Services is concerned and I know the Members have been terrifically upset by the recent statement by the Assistant Secretary of Defense for installation and logistics that even if there is one percent error in this big procurement budget, this is less than 150,000 errors or \$420 million annually.

Mr. Speaker, even worse than this is the failure to get usable equipment and armamentaria in the hands of troops in time to be useful.

I refer to what has become of CARA—this stands for combat aircrew recovery aircraft for any theater of operations. Requests for proposals were made over 10 months ago by the Department of Defense and then were suddenly hushed in favor of an advance rescue system known as ARS.

In the interim those who were asked to submit proposals on a preferred basis

have heard nothing, despite a substantial investment on their part, perhaps as much as \$25 million collectively.

This is fully explored by a letter to the full House Committee on Armed Services which was reported in yesterday's closed meeting of the House Committee on Armed Services but which will be published in the Journal of the Armed Forces in the current issue dated March 9.

It is a most succinct editorial.

It raises the question properly and repeatedly about when we are going to get the requisite equipment in the hands of the users rather than fiddle with hanky panky and excuses about procurement from that puzzle palace known as the Pentagon.

I recommend that Members read it and review it in detail:

WHATEVER BECAME OF CARA?

A crash program to produce a new air rescue aircraft for use in Vietnam has been swallowed up in a fog of Pentagon silence.

Ten top aerospace firms reportedly spent upwards of \$25-million putting together proposals for the aircraft—at the Pentagon's request—only to see the project disappear in a black-out of official information.

It all began last April when the Air Force asked industry to submit proposals for a new, high speed rescue aircraft capable of swiftly penetrating intense anti-aircraft defenses in North Vietnam to pick up downed airmen before their capture by North Vietnamese search parties.

The Air Force said the plane—labeled CARA for Combat Aircrew Recovery Aircraft—represented an urgent "Southeast Asia operational requirement."

Contractors were given only 30 days in which to prepare and submit proposals. In a classified "bidders briefing" to industry on 5 May 1967, an Air Force spokesman promised that evaluation of the bids would be completed within 30 days after submission, and that a decision would follow within another "48 hours."

At the briefing, sources said the AF official declared that "time is more important than money."

Contractors were asked to guarantee delivery of at least six new aircraft, fully operational in Southeast Asia, within 36 months. Ten major industrial firms set up special teams to speed completion of proposals, which subsequently were submitted to the Air Force.

Technical and cost evaluation of the proposals was completed on schedule at Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio, on 30 June, last year.

Today—10 months after the Air Force rushed to industry for help—none of the ten contractors has received any official word on the status of the CARA program. Nor have any been told how their designs fared in the evaluation.

One industry official said his firm "hasn't even had an official acknowledgement that our proposal was received."

The specifics of what it cost industry to prepare the CARA proposals is not known. But one contractor said his firm poured more than one million dollars of company funds into its plan. Another indicated that this expenditure may be low, compared with what others spent. Some firms submitted more than one proposal. The source said overall outlays by all of the firms probably total in the neighborhood of \$25 million.

Despite the enormous expenditure, however, it now appears that the Air Force has quietly removed the "urgent" tag which it previously appended to the program.

The Air Force and OSD have just completed work on a new Development Concept Paper to guide a "longer term" effort, focus-

ing on the total combat air rescue problem as opposed to design of a new aircraft. The term "CARA" has been dropped. The program is now called the Advanced Rescue System (ARS).

DoD plans call for an integrated study of new detection devices and beacons and better Combat Air Patrol, or fighter cover for the rescue forces. It was not clear to what extent the ARS study may involve new aircraft designs.

Pentagon sources said the best guess is that Contract Definition for the new rescue system would not take place before FY '70. At the earliest, this would mean that serious industry help on a new rescue aircraft (if one is sought) will not be requested again until at least July of 1969—two years and two months after last year's "urgent" plea for immediate help.

Given normal Pentagon lead times, this means new aircraft would not be rolling off production lines until mid-1975.

So far, no one has officially told industry why the ground rules on CARA have changed. Unofficial comments, on the other hand, have been both contradictory and vague, sources claim.

Officials of five of the ten companies submitting CARA proposals were contacted by THE JOURNAL. All said their firms are disturbed by AF and DoD failure to follow through with official action on the CARA program.

One said, "CARA did not just involve a budgetary quote. This was a fixed price incentive proposal, which contractors were willing to sit down and negotiate. This was not just a preliminary design contest. It was a major industry effort—the kind that involves the company president and his financial, engineering and production staffs."

On the other hand, Congressional sources informed THE JOURNAL that the "procuring command" (AFLC), the "user" command (MAC), and the "customer" (PACAF) reportedly are agreed that none of the CARA proposals offered any significant improvements over present air rescue techniques. "As a matter of fact," one source said, "the Air Force concluded that the proposals were essentially exercises in industry brochuremanship."

If this charge is true, some of the "brochures" seem to have been excessively fancy. Industry officials told THE JOURNAL that the Air Force "request for proposal" required full compliance with the complex AF "375 series" systems management procedures developed for the C-5A competition.

One contractor submitted 24 separate proposal volumes, covering aircraft configuration, test program, cost, value engineering, PERT, systems managements, etc. Another firm estimated that its proposal volumes would form a stack about two feet tall.

For whatever reason, the Air Force, nevertheless, has maintained strict official silence about the outcome of the proposals.

In recent Senate testimony, Air Force CofS General J. P. McConnell commented that the Air Force has "a requirement for an Advanced Rescue System (ARS)," but he made no mention of CARA, of the outcome of the CARA design competition, or of the fact that industry had even been approached about the problem. He noted only that the FY '69 budget includes funds "to initiate ARS development planning action."

One source said the statement "suggests that last year's urgent need for a new, high speed aircraft has dissipated—for reasons not explained to industry—into a requirement for some pretty routine paperwork."

During the 10-month period which has elapsed since the CARA problem was first farmed out to industry, rough estimates indicate that about 300 airmen have been shot down or have had to bail out over North Vietnam. Although exact figures are classified, it is understood that only one out of three downed crewmen are being rescued.

Pentagon figures released on 22 February show that 223 Navy, Marine Corps and Air Force personnel are known to have been captured since 1961. DoD also lists another 652 Air Force, Navy and Marine Corps personnel as "missing." Many presumably are pilots or crew members taken prisoner after bailing out over North Vietnam. It is known that over 800 aircraft have been shot down or lost over North Vietnam.

Director of Defense Research and Engineering John S. Foster emphasized the seriousness of the air losses in a recent statement to Congress (THE JOURNAL, 24 February). He commented that "Increase effectiveness of NVN anti-aircraft systems indicates greater potential air attrition in the future. This is a very serious trend."

The trend has not accelerated the demand for a new combat air rescue aircraft, however. In fact, DoD sources told THE JOURNAL that the CARA program has been put on a back burner, with short-range research efforts now being focused on such things as "new radios, new beacon lights." One source said, "We just don't know if, even with a new aircraft, we would be much better off than we are now."

The source would not comment when THE JOURNAL inquired what had led the Pentagon to believe, ten months ago, that a new aircraft would have improved the situation, or what had developed since last April to create a change of mind.

The official commented only that "initiation of the project was flawed. Cooler heads prevailed. There are a lot of V-STOL politics involved and they are terribly complicated."

The fog of silence still enshrouds the question of whatever became of the industry proposals on CARA.

AMERICA: BEAUTIFUL, FREE, AND STRONG

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, it is with a special kind of enthusiasm that I call to the attention of my colleagues an inspiring and thought-provoking article that has been written by Mrs. Becky Walker, associate publisher of the Grand Junction, Colo. Daily Sentinel. Mrs. Walker, following trips to Australia, Southeast Asia and to countries behind the Iron Curtain, has contributed a series of some 100 articles reporting her observations of the human and natural resources of these areas.

In her final article, Mrs. Walker presents a particularly incisive review of the values that she discovered in her travels, as well as those she held before she ever left home. The article follows:

AMERICA—BEAUTIFUL, FREE, AND STRONG

(PUBLISHER'S NOTE.—In a series of more than 100 articles, readers of THE DAILY SENTINEL have been given an insight into life behind the Iron Curtain few Americans have had. These articles have been written by Mrs. Preston Walker who, as a keen and observing reporter, has reported facts and refrained from injecting her opinions or conclusions. In this, the final article, we have asked her to tell what makes America different than Iron Curtain countries, than Asia, than Australia. She tells, dramatically, why she is proud of her country, her state and her city, Grand Junction.)

(By Becky Walker)

My trips to Australia, Asia and behind the Iron Curtain have, above all, given me a sense of belonging to the most magnificent nation the world has ever produced. My great pride in being an American now has foundation on fact, rather than just that nebulous pride you feel for the area of your origin.

Wherever I went, to whomever I talked, I found a longing for what America IS and HAS that goes far beyond the so-called material wealth. America is a symbol of individual freedom that will never be forgotten. It is and will be a continued inspiration to the common people of all lands.

It was the first truly classless nation on earth. It remains as such today. It is the one nation where a man is respected for what he achieves—not because he comes from a certain family and class.

Family origin and wealth are respected here as in all nations. But, the individual who really touches the heart of America is still the one of good thinking, devotion to family and community, a man who is gentle and wise and filled with good humor.

Here, a man or woman born to poverty knows he or she can rise to the greatest honors by ability and the wise use of that ability.

In other nations, this is not so.

Wherever I've traveled, behind the Iron Curtain and outside it, a man born to poverty is doomed to poverty no matter how able he may be. In the same context a man born to wealth and position maintains that position no matter how stupid he may be. He may drop to the material poverty level but he maintains his exalted position of birth.

In Italy, once a bellboy, always a bellboy. In America a bellboy can and often does become owner of the hotel.

America is still the land of opportunity.

Too often, as Americans, we scourge ourselves with whips of self pity and scorn because we feel we are a nation of materialists. I've seen truly materialistic nations like Russia and we are not like that.

It is my conclusion we are deeply spiritualistic and idealistic as well as lazy in the right way—a real contrast.

After all why should man labor at spirit-breaking, heartbreaking drudgery when he can invent, produce and run a machine raising his standard of living to what we Americans consider virtually a birthright today.

England and Australia may laugh at our central heating. But who buys central heating plants as soon as they can accumulate money and know-how? Europe sneers at the ostentatious American chrome-plated, giant car. But, who scrapes and saves to own one? They do!

Yes, most of the sneers from abroad about our "materialistic outlook," our "crudeness," our freedom to criticize at the top of our lungs, and our ebullient good spirits, results from sheer envy. It really amounts to jealous name-calling by nations and individuals doing the criticizing.

That great "spiritualistic" nation many of our youth and teachers feel necessary to go harping after, Russia is so envious of our prosperity of mind and physical well-being her sole ambition is to produce more material wealth than can America and Americans.

Russians now are finding out their cult of communism is not working. Too many there have found out work is for the birds—so let George do it. Individual incentives are now necessary to keep production up to within shouting distance of goals set by the Russian politicians.

I've found the average Russian is no more excited about communism than you and I. Russia, itself, is composed of 28 nations of dissenting peoples. The voice of the government does not express the feelings of the average Russian any more than our government voices our personal feelings.

Many large groups are still fighting the government. What is so different about that?

Don't we have dissension here between races, between religions, between political beliefs? We have grown great on dissension and its product change.

Such dissension does not mean the fall of communism or the fall of capitalism. It does mean, however, that both great nations are growing, changing, trying to cope with problems both internally and externally.

In many ways the Russian stand on Vietnam is typical. Officially, they back Ho Chi Minh and North Vietnam. Unofficially they are darned glad we are there doing the fighting because if there is one nation Russia fears with the fear of the devils of hell it is China.

So long as America is involved on the southern border of China, Russia and most Russians feel the old Chinese dragon is going to keep its attention on the south rather than look to and cross the northern borders into the Soviet states.

Did you know that Russia maintains vast supply depots, soldiers and planes on the great perimeter of China? A sudden troop movement of Chinese to the north throws Russia into a tizzy like nothing we ever see here in America.

I know, I saw part of such a "tizzy" when in Ulan Bator and Alma Alta. Borders were summarily closed, transportation limited, and people's movements constricted.

The average Russian is kept in great ignorance of this. He doesn't have the communications we do. Yet, with all our vaunted press and radio services, is his predicament so much different than ours on the other side of the fence? We don't read what is freely printed. They don't print it.

I want no part of the Russian problem because I feel they are so much farther behind us in human understanding and human endeavor. Our differences are vast and myriad.

In America we respect the dignity of the individual. By so doing our group has integrity and the nation a purpose. In Russia the individual is nothing, the group alone gets respect. I found this left an unease, a lack of security that goes far to create the suspicious attitude of the average Russian. This attitude is reflected by the nation.

They think everyone is out to take advantage of them. This IS the result of disrespect for the individual.

In my travels I have learned that individual people are much the same the world over.

The gentle little, old Indian school teacher in Singapore is worried about the lack of respect the youth of today show their elders.

The middle-aged lady in Tashkent worries because her daughter wants to leave home and get a job.

The elderly man in Kabul, Afghanistan, was upset because his son thought they should have sanitary facilities inside the house.

The mother in Mongolia was worried for fear her son would have to go to war with China.

The old lady in Moscow was furious because her children would not mind her anymore and wanted to run around the streets at night in tight pants and long hair—both son and daughter.

The problems we face in Grand Junction are the same as those faced in similar size cities in Russia, East Germany, Japan, Taiwan, Australia, Tahiti, Mongolia and Italy.

Why Not?

After all, we are all people. We love. We hate. We fight with one another. We gossip. We lie. We steal. We are gentle. We are kind. We are neighborly. We work. We play. We have kids. We live. We die. And hippies are everywhere.

But, I would rather face my problems here in Grand Junction, in our beautiful Grand Valley, in this glorious state of Colorado, in this marvelous United States, than anywhere else I've been in the world.

We have the freedom to do something about our problems with less restrictions, frustrations and with more zeal and active interest than anywhere else.

We are more healthy and more inventive.

We are better educated and more deeply concerned about our fellow man than any other nation despite noises these nations make in their papers and over their radios.

We back up our concern with deeds on a nation-wide world-wide scale. Not even Russia can claim this.

Indeed, I am so proud of my country and my people I could outbrag a Texan.

We ARE the greatest nation on earth.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2531. An act to designate the San Gabriel Wilderness, Angeles National Forest, in the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2419. An act to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, with respect to the development of cargo container vessels, and for other purposes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks upon other subject matters than those pertaining to the eulogy of the late Speaker Martin in the RECORD and to include pertinent extraneous material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

TRIBUTES TO THE LATE JOSEPH W. MARTIN, FORMER SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 hour.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to officially report to the House the death of our former colleague and Speaker, the Honorable Joseph W. Martin, Jr. of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

He was a humble man who rose to great heights but who never forgot those with whom he worked and struggled on the way up. While he received high honors and greatly prized titles, he was always referred to by those who knew him simply as "Joe" Martin. He was not one for whom pomp and ceremony held any appeal, yet he could lend dignity to any occasion. He was warm, human and friendly and always had time to lend the hand of kindness and experience to young Members of Congress when they went to him for a sense of direction.

He was the leader of the Republican party for many years, and many of those years were lean years for his party, but Joe was an eternal optimist. Like the fast film which is used in our cameras today, he could project, a well developed picture taken in a light which would reflect but darkness to most of us. The bright side of life was a reflection of his own image.

The Congress of the United States and particularly the House of Representatives, which is closest to the people, has been often acclaimed as the defender of the Republic, as the principal shield in the preservation of our form of government and its institutions, and that it reflects the combined voice of our people. All of us who serve here have been honored in a very special way. Some of us are the sons of immigrants to this country, but there was no need for us to be steeped in tradition to qualify for our positions here. This body, then, is unique not only in terms of modern politics, but it has, in fact, been the long sought dream of civilization itself.

Our individual position as a Member of Congress is important, but there is another position of even greater significance. I refer to the one man chosen to be our leader as the Speaker of the House of Representatives. If we are honored to be a Member of this body, how much greater are the laurels accorded to any man who is elected by all the Representatives of the people as their voice. In the long history of the Congress only 43 other men have been so honored. In the 80th Congress, when Joe Martin was Speaker, and there was no Vice President of the United States, he was only a heartbeat away from being the President of the United States. He also served as the Speaker of the 83d Congress.

One of the great personalities and statesmen of our times has passed to his reward. He was a valued friend, and his consideration for his fellowman was so evidently sincere that even a mere associate was made to feel as close as his dearest friend. Joe could not be distant to any human being.

His name and fame were known to me long before I knew the man himself, but, I am proud to say, after serving with him in Congress for 17 years, that here, indeed, was a man whose true greatness matched his great reputation. His record was real, not contrived.

I believe that on this day following his death it is appropriate that we quote his official biography as it appeared in the Congressional Directory for the last year he served here in the House, I quote:

Joseph William Martin, Jr., Republican of North Attleboro, Mass.; born November 3, 1884; educated in the public schools of North Attleboro; honorary degrees: LL.D., Tufts College, Medford, Mass.; LL.D., Pennsylvania Military College, Chester, Pa.; D.C.L., Boston University, Boston, Mass.; LL.D., Stonehill College, North Easton, Mass.; LL.D., Dartmouth College, Hanover, N.H.; LL.D., Syracuse University, Syracuse, N.Y.; master of science, Bradford Durfee Technical Institute Fall River, Mass.; M.S.B.A., Bryant College, Providence, R.I.; Doctor of Jurisprudence, Portia Law School; Doctor of Laws, New England College, publisher of Evening Chronicle, North Attleboro and Franklin Sentinel, Franklin, Mass.; member Massachusetts House of Representatives, 1912-14; member Massachusetts State Senate 1914-17;

chairman, Massachusetts Republican Legislative Campaign Committee, 1917; Harding-Coolidge presidential elector, 1920; executive secretary, Republican State committee, 1922-25; delegate to Republican National Conventions of 1916, 1936, 1940, 1944, 1948, and 1952; permanent chairman of the Republican National Conventions of 1940, 1944, 1948, 1952, and 1956; chairman, Republican Congressional Campaign Committee in 1938; member of the Republican National Committee, 1936-40; chairman, Republican National Committee from July 1940 to November 1942; in 1924 elected Member of the 69th and each succeeding Congress, including the 89th; elected minority leader 76th to 85th Congresses except the 80th and 83rd, in which he was elected Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, newspapers throughout the world will tell his story. At this early moment following his death, I have but three articles in my possession which touch upon the highlights of his life, and, at this point I wish to present excerpts from these, as follows:

[From the Boston Globe, Mar. 7, 1968]

JOE MARTIN DIES AT 83 IN FLORIDA—IN CONGRESS 42 YEARS AND SPEAKER TWICE—LIVED, RAN PAPER IN NORTH ATTLEBORO

Joseph W. Martin Jr., a U.S. congressman for 42 years and Republican leader of the House for half that period, died Wednesday afternoon in Memorial Hospital, Hollywood, Fla., shortly after a sudden attack. He was 83.

Martin, who at one time was first in line of succession to the presidency, was wintering with relatives in Ft. Lauderdale to seek relief from arthritis.

His long-time secretary, Mrs. Alice Agnew of North Attleboro, said the death "came very much as a shock."

"He had taken off some weight," she said, "and everyone who saw him this Winter thought he had improved very much."

Mrs. Agnew said Martin had expected to return to his home in North Attleboro this Spring.

Funeral services were set tentatively for Monday morning in St. Mary's Church, North Attleboro.

Martin had retired from the public view almost entirely after his defeat for a 22d term in Congress in September, 1966.

The loss, one of the few in his half-century political career, came in the Republican primary where he was beaten by Mrs. Margaret Heckler.

That primary night he said: "I've always done the best I know how. If the people want me, fine. If they don't, I ain't going to get upset."

Joe Martin twice served as Speaker of the House, the nation's second most powerful office, but he never lost touch with his beloved home town, North Attleboro.

Over the years he became a familiar and powerful figure in the Capital, but he always remained a familiar and friendly figure along North Attleboro's North Washington St.

It was North Attleboro, a small manufacturing town 35 miles southwest of Boston, that the Joe Martin story began.

On Nov. 3, 1884, Joseph W. Martin, Jr. was born in North Attleboro, across the street from his father's blacksmith shop.

His father, Joseph Martin, who worked 16 hours a day to earn \$15 a week to support his wife, Katherine, Katon Martin, and their eight children, was a Presbyterian of Scotch descent.

Mrs. Martin, who died at age 96 in 1957, was a Roman Catholic of Irish descent.

Joe was the second child and eldest son.

Young Joe began helping the family finances with his earnings from a newspaper delivery route in his grade school days. It established a pattern that he was to follow through his long political life—direct and friendly contact with his constituents.

While attending North Attleboro High School, Joe became an outstanding shortstop. As a freshman he got five hits while playing against nearby Pawtucket (R.I.) High School. Then he declined a scholarship offer from Dartmouth College, where he later financed the education of two younger brothers, Albert and Edward.

After high school graduation, Joe took a job as a reporter with The North Attleboro Leader. When the newspaper ceased publication after six months, he switched to the Attleboro Sun at a salary of \$10 a week. Later he worked as North Attleboro correspondent for The Providence Journal.

From an early age Martin saved money regularly. At his death he maintained a savings account which he opened in 1902 in the Attleboro Savings Bank, and after several years as a young reporter he had accumulated \$1000.

ROSE TO TOP

With that nest egg, Joe, then 24-years-old, raised more money from fellow townsmen and purchased The North Attleboro Chronicle. He was believed to have been the youngest publisher of a daily newspaper in the United States in that period. Under his management, The Chronicle's circulation rose from 800 to 4000 daily.

Over the years, Martin gradually bought out his partners. In his book, "My First 50 Years in Politics," Martin said his purchase of The Chronicle was the best financial investment he ever made.

"You know," he once said, "newspapers and community service are pretty closely tied together."

So the next step was politics.

Though a militant Republican, Martin got his start in politics as a Democrat—and lost. Without his knowledge, a friend entered his name as a Democratic candidate for the North Attleboro School Committee. He was defeated by 56 votes.

RETIRED IN 1917

His first experience in state politics was as a manager of a friend's campaign for the state Legislature. He became fascinated by the rough-and-tumble world, and at age 27 Joe became a candidate himself for the Massachusetts House. He was elected and served from 1912 to 1914, when he was elected to the State Senate, where he served until 1917.

Martin retired from politics in 1917, intending to devote his future to business, which in later years included the acquisition of an insurance agency and a weekly newspaper, The Franklin Sentinel.

In 1922, Republican leaders drafted him to consolidate and harmonize party factions in Massachusetts, and he became executive secretary of the Republican State Committee.

In 1924 Martin ran for Congress in the Republican primary but was defeated. Before the general election, the incumbent Republican died. The local GOP organization picked Martin to take his place on the ticket.

Joe won the election and on Mar. 4, 1925, took his seat in Congress.

"The people of my district have been good to me," Joe Martin said several years ago, "and I intend to represent them as long as they let me."

Most of the people of Joe's 14th District, which includes parts of four counties in southeastern Massachusetts, would agree that Joe also has been good to them.

For the most part, Martin's constituents worked in textile, costume jewelry and shoe-manufacturing plants or small poultry and dairy farms.

Joe was never too busy to help them all, both the wealthy and those of modest means.

For example, several years ago a young man with several children awaited a substantial income tax rebate. When the check failed to arrive, he wrote numerous letters and made several long trips to the Internal Revenue regional office in Boston. He was in-

formed that the check was being held up by a technicality.

Almost a year passed, and Christmas was just a few weeks away, and still the check had not arrived. So the young man stopped into Joe Martin's battered old office in the Chronicle building on Church st.

GOT RESULTS

Martin, with his broad face, full lips and tousled black hair that was familiar to millions of television viewers of Republican National Conventions, listened quiet, almost without comment, as the young man explained that although he was a registered Democrat, he needed help. Martin scratched a word or two on a piece of copy paper and the brief interview ended.

Two days later the young man received a special delivery letter from the New England director of the Internal Revenue Service, stating that Cong. Joseph W. Martin Jr. had requested that the rebate matter be investigated. The following day the long awaited check arrived and the young man's children enjoyed a merrier Christmas.

Shortly after he went to Washington in 1924, Martin was chosen assistant to the House Republican floor leader, Bertrand H. Snell of New York, and began his rise up the G.O.P. ladder.

In the National campaign of 1936, Martin was eastern campaign manager. He was elected chairman of the National Republican Congressional Committee in 1937, succeeding the late Chester C. Bolton.

FRIEND OF FDR

In 1938, when Republican House members had been reduced to 89—a 50 year record—Martin, as national chairman, swung into action. He raised money and directed a campaign that resulted in 80 new Republicans being elected. The bolstered Republican delegation promptly elected him minority leader.

As chairman of the GOP National Committee, he managed the late Wendell L. Willkie's presidential campaign in 1940. He continued as national chairman until resigning in 1942. He was permanent chairman of the GOP National Convention in 1940, 1944, 1948, 1952 and 1956. No other man presided over so many Republican conventions.

During the 1940 presidential campaign, Martin said what the country needed was an administration that "will speak softly and carry a big stick, rather than talk big and carry a swagger stick."

Opposed to the New Deal during the '30s, Martin criticized the Roosevelt administration policies with vigor, although he supported the wage-hour and the Social Security program.

Despite his opposition, Martin and President Roosevelt remained on friendly terms. During a visit to the White House, Roosevelt told Martin he had set a trap for the Republicans in a forthcoming State of the Union message.

"So make sure you don't cheer in the wrong places," he added.

BECAME A SLOGAN

Later the President asked: "Well, Joe, did you cheer in the wrong places?"

Martin replied: "No, Mr. President, we didn't cheer at all."

Roosevelt roared with laughter.

During the 1940 campaign, Roosevelt scored isolationists with his famed crack concerning "Martin, Barton and Fish." He later told Martin: "The only reason I put your name in was because it rhymed with Barton."

Joe Martin served as Speaker of the House during the 80th and 83d Congresses. During the first term as speaker in 1947, he was first in line of succession to the presidency in the event of a vacancy because at the time there was no Vice President to function.

President Truman advocated the new law soon after he, as Vice President, succeeded President Roosevelt on the latter's death.

His reasoning was that an elected official instead of an appointed one should succeed to the presidency. Previously, the Secretary of State ranked next to the Vice President.

In 1948, Martin was mentioned as a dark horse candidate for President.

A few years later, when the Republicans again controlled Congress, Martin again became Speaker of the House.

AT PEACE

In recent years, Joe (he insisted his friends call him that) remained in the background. He was reelected every two years until 1966 with his customary substantial plurality, but seemed content to retreat to comparative obscurity.

A lifelong bachelor, Martin lived for years in a Washington hotel, a short distance from the White House.

"I'm at peace with the world," he said after his defeat as Minority Leader. "I'm not bitter about anything. I hold no resentment. Why should I? I have no regrets."

He leaves his sister, Mrs. Nettie Kelly, with whom he lived in North Attleboro, and two brothers, Albert Martin, editor of *The North Attleboro Chronicle*, and Edward Martin of Wellesley Hills, the newspaper's general manager.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 7, 1968]

EX-SPEAKER MARTIN, 83, DIES IN FLORIDA

(By Richard L. Lyons)

Joseph W. Martin Jr., former Speaker of the House whose political career spanned more than five decades, died yesterday in Hollywood, Fla. He was 83.

Mr. Martin, who was a member of Congress from 1924 to 1966, had been spending the winter in Fort Lauderdale. He was stricken Tuesday and died in Memorial Hospital.

At the height of his political power, no man had greater claim to the title, "Mr. Republican," than Mr. Martin, the son of a Massachusetts blacksmith who first won public office in 1911 when he was elected to the Massachusetts Legislature.

Calvin Coolidge called him "Jos-eff", accenting the second syllable, but to everyone else he was Joe for more than a half century of public life. He personified rock-ribbed conservatism in the 1930s, but more than that he was a loyal party man and a pro. The Republican Party was his life, and in return it gave him every honor it could bestow except the Presidency.

As a boy, Joe Martin marched in a torchlight parade for McKinley in 1896. As a man, he served in the House longer than any other Republican except "Uncle Joe" Cannon, Speaker 60 years ago. Mr. Martin sat in the House 42 years, was its Republican leader for 20 years, Speaker for four, chairman of five Republican national conventions and Republican national chairman.

Finally at 81, he was defeated in the 1966 party primary by a 35-year-old woman, Margaret Heckler, who quoted the words Joe Martin had used in his first race in 1924—that the incumbent was too old.

Mr. Martin started up the leadership ladder during the lean years of the New Deal. He was floor manager of Alf Landon's nomination in 1936, campaign manager for Wendell Willkie in 1940, chairman of the congressional campaign that started Republicans back toward power in the House in 1938 and finally Speaker in the 80th and 83d Congresses.

Sam Rayburn and Joe Martin exchanged the Speaker's gavel four times and were fast friends. Asked once to campaign against Martin, Rayburn reportedly refused, snorting: "Hell, if I lived in his district I'd vote for him."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Mar. 7, 1968]

"MR. REPUBLICAN," JOSEPH W. MARTIN, 83, DIES; FORMER SPEAKER OF HOUSE

Joseph W. Martin Jr., 83, whose only bride was the House of Representatives he served for 42 years—twice as speaker—died yesterday in Florida, where he was spending the second winter of his retirement.

The plain-talking Yankee from North Attleboro, Mass., was stricken at the Fort Lauderdale, Fla., home of his nephew, George Kelly. He was taken to Memorial Hospital in Hollywood, where he died. An autopsy is scheduled to determine the exact cause of death.

"The country, the Republican party, have lost a great statesman," said Rep. Gerald R. Ford of Michigan, the current head of the House Republican leadership.

A bachelor, Martin's interests were the North Attleboro Chronicle, which he owned since 1906, and the House.

ONLY CHURCH I HAVE

He once refused to shorten the daily prayers of the House chaplain, explaining: "This is the only church I have, you know."

His long reign as House GOP leader, which included chairmanship of the Republican national conventions for five straight nominating sessions from 1940 through 1956 and consideration as a dark-horse candidate against Harry S. Truman in 1948, came to an abrupt end in 1959. A Republican caucus unceremoniously replaced him with a younger man, Rep. Charles A. Halleck of Indiana.

Then, in a GOP primary in 1966, he lost his party's nomination to Mrs. Margaret Heckler. He had asked his constituents to send him back for "just one more term."

Characteristically, he found a silver lining in his defeat.

"I'm damned glad to get out of the business of politics," he said. "I can start looking after my health. You can't win them all; I can forget the losses when I think of the successes."

His successes include a total of 20 years as his party's House leader, 21 successful campaigns for Congress, and the title of "Mr. Republican."

After his defeat (in 1966), Martin returned to North Attleboro. Before leaving, he turned in the chauffeured limousine provided him by the House. He had turned it in once before, when he was bounced as GOP leader.

But the House, as a token of esteem—or perhaps remorse—pushed through a resolution making chauffeured limousines available to former speakers. Joe Martin was the only one.

Mr. Speaker, the historians will recall that this was a common man of uncommon qualities. Today we observe the passing of a distinguished American who served his people and his country well.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan, our distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply saddened by the passing of Joe Martin. I was a relatively young man when I first was sworn in as a Member of this body. Joe Martin had already reached the heights, but he was very helpful to me. At no time was Joe Martin ever aloof from any new Member. He was warm, he was friendly, he was anxious to help in any and every way he could.

He was loved by everybody, and he was respected by everyone. Joe Martin was

recognized by his political party for virtually every high post in the party organization. I suspect if Joe Martin had wanted it, he could have been a party nominee on the national ticket.

The life of Joe Martin revolved around the House of Representatives. He loved being associated with the 434 other Members of this great body. He believed that the House of Representative was a bulwark of strength in our American political system. His contribution over many, many years as a legislator in this body is unmatched in American history. One could relate one incident after another to illustrate how he worked for the common good of all people and of our Nation.

Joe Martin was a great American. Joe Martin will be remembered by those of us who served with him as one of the finest men we ever knew.

There was a time when everyone in this country called Joe Martin "Mr. Republican." This was recognition of the tremendous service he had rendered to the Republican Party and the leadership role he had exercised in party affairs. But Joe Martin was far more than a party leader. He was a dedicated American—a man deeply devoted to advancing the best interests of the United States. He was above all a man who served his country and served it well.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I join the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts and his colleagues and all others who have had the honor of serving with Joe Martin in their words of tribute to one of the great former Members and Speakers of this House. When I came to Congress more than 21 years ago, Joe Martin was at the pinnacle of his magnificent political and legislative career. After long years as majority leader, he had become Speaker of the House in the newly organized 80th Congress. Few men have ever known the House as Joe Martin knew it. Few men were better schooled in the nature and character of American politics. He was one of those whose service has given honor to this body and prestige to the American political system.

The story of Joe Martin is the story of America. He began as the son of a blacksmith and rose to be perhaps the most powerful Republican on the scene at the end of the Roosevelt era. As a young man, Joe was a semipro baseball player, but he was a full-fledged professional in this House and in the politics of this country.

Joseph W. Martin was a staunch Member of his party, but more than that, he was a great American. He was a friend of every Member of this House. He was highly respected and beloved on both sides of the aisle. He was kind, friendly, and always considerate of others. His career in the House will long be remembered for its great contribution to the era in which he lived and served. We, of course, are all happy that Joe had a long and useful life—he has earned his eternal rest.

Mrs. Albert and I join in extending our heartfelt sympathy to his loved ones and to his great host of friends.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES. I yield to the distinguished minority whip.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, what started out early this morning as a most pleasant and promising day completely changed to one of sadness for me when I picked up the paper and learned of the passing of my warm personal friend, Joe Martin. A bright, sunny day of hope and cheer suddenly became for me one of discouragement and despair. It just did not seem possible—not even right—that the man with whom I served so many years in the House of Representatives, which he loved, and for whom I had the deepest affection, was no longer with us.

Few people like Joe Martin come into our lives. As minority whip and as majority whip in the two terms he served as Speaker of this House, I worked closely with him. I came to know him intimately. I probably knew him as few people in this House knew him. I knew how he thought, his goals, his ideals, and his principles. To know him was to love him as a man of warmth and to respect him as a man of high principle and great acumen.

Uppermost in his mind, at all times, was what was good for our country, what was good for his district and what was best for the Republican Party. I recall so vividly, back in the thirties, when our party's political fortunes were at such a low state—when many were predicting its demise and few expressed even the hope of its revival—that Joe Martin confidently continued on tirelessly, night and day, that the Republican Party would live to fight another day.

It can be truly said that our Republican Party owes a debt of gratitude to Joe Martin, and to the few individuals who came to his aid. The entire country owes a debt of gratitude to Joe Martin, more than to any one individual I know, for keeping alive our two-party system of government.

In the fullest sense of the word, Joe Martin was an extraordinary man in many, many ways. I only wish that many of you now serving in the House had been privileged to know him when he first took over the reins of leadership. I wish you had been privileged to observe how astutely and how effectively he operated to make a small minority voice heard. I can well recall many exchanges he had with Speaker Sam Rayburn. To watch them challenge and maneuver in parliamentary procedures and debate was like watching two giants in combat. And two giants they were.

It is legendary that no two political adversaries ever had the affection and respect for each other as Speaker Sam Rayburn and Speaker Joe Martin, which ever of them occupied the chair while the other contested from the floor. Each knew of the other that he would never betray a confidence nor break a promise. Each also knew of each other that they both had the same objective and that was to do what he thought to be best for the country.

Joe Martin was truly a great man. All of us mourn his passing. Mrs. Arends joins me in extending our sympathy to the family.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished majority whip.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES], the majority leader, the minority leader, the minority whip, and others who have expressed these beautiful sentiments about our late colleague and distinguished Speaker, Joe Martin.

I, too, came here as a young man for the first time 27 years ago. At that time Joe Martin was the unquestioned leader of the Republican Party not only in this House but also in the Nation. As the gentleman from Massachusetts has pointed out, he was devoid of pomp or ceremony. He wore his title and position with simplicity and dignity, and he was always pleasant and friendly and willing to extend a helping hand to a new Member of this body, regardless of the side of the aisle on which he served.

I remember him so well. I soon learned of his deep affection for each Member of this body and of his love for this institution and for what it stands.

He of course was a great partisan, but never in the parochial or petty sense. He was a partisan in that he articulated the philosophy of the Republican Party ably and well and without hesitation, but invariably he put the interest of his country first.

So I am proud, Mr. Speaker, to have known this man and to have been associated with him.

I might say it is a great tribute to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts that in a relatively short period of time that great State has produced two great Speakers of this body, one on the Republican side and our distinguished Speaker, who has served us so well and faithfully for so many years, JOHN MCCORMACK.

The Nation has lost a man who upheld the traditions of this body in the best sense of the word. I join in expressing sympathy to the members of his family.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts, who represents the district once so well served by our former Speaker, Joe Martin, with such great distinction.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, an era of American history has been brought to a close with Speaker Martin's passing. His remarkable life and colorful career as Speaker of the House of Representatives and six times permanent chairman of the Republican National Convention and chairman of the Republican National Committee have now become an American legend to be recorded as a part of our Nation's history.

It is true of Joe Martin that those who knew him personally will reminisce for years to come and will pass on to future

generations their fond recollections of a truly beloved public figure. His constituents will recall the warmth of his person-to-person contacts. Political scientists will remember his unique and dynamic leadership which prompted President Roosevelt's exasperation and use of the phrase "Martin, Barton, and Fish." Our country will remember the outstanding contributions of a great American leader.

At this moment all Americans regardless of party must feel a deep sadness at the news of Joe Martin's passing. I grieve at his loss, and I extend my sympathy to the members of his family.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that we note the passing of Joseph Martin, former Speaker of this body and a distinguished and honorable Representative from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

Joe Martin, in his lifetime, has characterized in many ways. But the words used most often to describe him were "loyal," "trusted," and "professional." He had the confidence of every Republican President from Coolidge to Eisenhower, and the respect of every President from Coolidge to Johnson. He represented a way of life, fast disappearing, the life of smalltown America; and his dedication to the principles of that life made him a major force in the Congress and in the Nation.

Joe Martin was born in North Attleboro, Mass., in 1884, the son of a blacksmith. He was educated in their public schools and then turned down a scholarship to Dartmouth College in order to become a newspaperman. It is impossible to say when he entered politics. We can say when he was first elected to office, but it seems as though Joe Martin was always in politics. We know he marched in a torchlight parade for President McKinley in 1896 when he was only 12 years old.

In 1912 he entered the State Legislature of Massachusetts. He served in the house until 1915 when he entered the State senate where he served until 1917. Then he returned to local party offices, serving his area and his party until 1925 when he entered the 69th Congress. He served in this body until the 90th Congress. He was Republican floor leader from 1939 to 1946, 1949 to 1952, and from 1955 to 1959; in the 80th and 83d Congresses he was Speaker of the House.

William S. White has said that the Speaker of the House is the second most influential elected official in Washington. I agree. And some Speakers in our history have shouldered responsibilities beyond those of the typical Speaker: Sam Rayburn, Joe Martin, and JOHN MCCORMACK. These men have had the respect and affection of the Presidents whom they served.

Joe Martin was a loyal party man and is responsible for bringing the Republican Party back to life. He believed in the two-party system and contributed to its strength. For this he earned the respect of all Members on both sides of the aisle.

President Roosevelt paid tribute to his influence in his phrase, "Martin, Barton, and Fish." President Truman also recognized his power and respected the man who led his party so well.

But Joe Martin was much more than just a party man. The greatest proof of this is that in the fight for the position of minority leader in 1960, he was criticized for working too closely with Speaker Rayburn. I think it shows that Joe Martin put the national interest above party at all times. As Speaker he assisted in the enactment of the Greek-Turkish aid program and the Marshall plan of President Truman. He sponsored and helped pass the constitutional amendment limiting the President to two terms.

Locally, talking about Massachusetts, he was in great part responsible for the Cape Cod National Park and the Minuteman National Park and also for the great work that he did in bringing the NASA installation to Boston.

When I was first elected to this body as a Member of the 83d Congress, Joe Martin was the Speaker. Much of my understanding of and respect for this House developed because he presented such a fine example to freshmen Congressmen. He was at all times helpful, understanding, and fair, and he had the esteem of both sides of the aisle.

He served his district, his State, and his Nation faithfully, fully, and well. We shall all miss him. I join my colleagues in extending my heartfelt sympathy to his family.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, it is always a sad day for Members of the House when we meet together to note the passing of one of our former colleagues, but it is a particularly sad day when we meet to note the passing of a former Speaker.

The Speakership is a unique institution, I think, in all legislative bodies. The Speaker of the House is elected by the members of his party, initially, but once elected he is the Speaker of all of the Members whether they be of his party or not.

In modern times—at least in the time since I have been privileged to serve as a Member of this great body—the institutions of this body have been guarded, molded, and extended by three great Speakers, the late Honorable Joseph Martin, the late Honorable Sam Rayburn and the great gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. JOHN McCORMACK.

Mr. Speaker, when I came to the House of Representatives in the 83d Congress, Joe Martin was the Speaker of the House of Representatives. He was therefore the first Speaker of the House of Representatives under whom I served. I can attest to his kindness, because of the manner in which he treated all of the new Members of Congress who came to the 83d Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the late Speaker Martin brought us along. He helped us. He helped us to become familiar with the great institution which is the House of Representatives of the United States, its rules

and its traditions. He imparted to us a great faith embodied in principle, a great feeling of responsibility for the preservation of this institution, and of the country it serves.

Mr. Speaker, the late Speaker Martin was a partisan man, as has been said here. He liked to win, as all legislative leaders like to win. But he was generous both in winning and in losing. He was a man who believed in his fellow man, who loved his fellow man, and who wanted to help his fellow man in the best way he could. He was a leader among men in every sense of the word. His passing leaves a void among all of us which will not soon be filled.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to express for Mrs. Rhodes and myself, our deep sadness and feeling of loss, in the passing of this great son of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, the late great, and beloved Joe Martin.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, the earliest recollection that I have of the House of Representatives and the high privilege of sitting in it as a Member of this body is the day that Joe Martin was elected Speaker of the House of Representatives at the beginning of the 83d Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I witnessed the transfer of the gavel from the late Sam Rayburn to the late Joe Martin upon that occasion.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to emphasize what the distinguished gentleman from Illinois has said just a few minutes ago—I know of no two men who lived in America and who served in this great representative body who, despite their membership in different political parties, combined their intellect and understanding more effectively in the solution of the problems of this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I was a young, new, inexperienced Member of the House of Representatives at that time.

Although he was a member of the opposite party, nevertheless, I found him to be just and fair and even helpful to a young Member of the House from the other party.

Joe Martin was typical of the opportunities that are available to citizens of this Nation—originating from humble circumstances and rising to the highest post in the legislative halls of this Nation. Joe Martin left the House a respected Member of all who had served with him, and he leaves this life with the love and affection of all of us who had the privilege of knowing him.

Mr. Speaker, I join with the others in extending to his loved ones my genuine sympathy.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I can only add a very few personal observations to those of my colleagues who have spoken here today so fondly of our friend and departed colleague, Joe Martin.

Like many other eminent Americans, Joe had a summer home in my district, and oftentimes when the heat of the political battle would frustrate him here in Washington, he would go up to the village of Sagamore and sit in his living room in a home overlooking Cape Cod Bay, getting strength from the sea stretched out before him.

I believe that he treasured his associations on Cape Cod in much the same way that he treasured the associations he made here in the House. The Cape Codders loved him as did his colleagues in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I join with those of us here today who will cherish the memory of this man and get and receive inspiration from the example that he set us as a devoted friend and public servant.

And so, Mr. Speaker, it is with great sorrow and a sense of personal loss that I join my colleagues today in paying tribute to "Mr. Republican," as Joe Martin was known. Certainly no man had greater claim to the title—for 42 years he demonstrated those qualities of leadership, understanding, and wisdom that led his colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote unanimously 6 years ago to immortalize him in the Capitol Rotunda. It was the first time a living person had been so honored—and Speaker McCORMACK summed up our feelings at the time when he said:

Joe Martin is possessed of the intangibles that make a man great.

Son of a blacksmith, Joe was a semi-professional baseball player and later a newspaperman. He began his political career in the Massachusetts Legislature, and was elected to Congress in 1924—the same year his friend and mentor, Calvin Coolidge, won the Presidency.

Joe Martin, who personified "rock-ribbed conservatism" in the 1930's, voted his district—for the National Recovery Act and social security, against low tariffs. But he moved with the times, and when his mills moved south and a Republican President favored trade, Joe Martin came over to the side of those favoring reciprocal trade.

When Joe Martin was Speaker of the House, his byword was fairplay—and he always gave equal consideration to both sides of an issue. When I first came to the House in 1958, Joe was a great source of inspiration and encouragement to the freshmen representing the district next to his.

As Joe Martin lost some of his aggressiveness and weathered some blows to his position and pride, he was still one of the most effective Members of Congress. He was truly a great man and a great American—and I feel honored to have been his friend and to have worked with him. Mrs. Keith joins with me in extending heartfelt condolences to his family.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES. I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Brooks].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts was Speaker of this body when I first came to Congress in January 1953. No man could have been more gracious or kinder to a new Member than he was to me.

This was typical of Speaker Martin for although he was a strong advocate of his Republican Party, he never let his partisanship affect his kindly manner nor did his party loyalty ever transcend his devotion to his country. When our Nation needed something he did not hesitate to join forces with the Democratic President and his colleagues on this side of the aisle to provide it.

Joe Martin was a gentleman in the truest sense of the word and history will record him as a great statesman and a great patriot.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. Bolton].

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for the privilege of saying something about the man who was so long our colleague here in the House of Representatives and our leader. Joe Martin was one of my husband's close friends. Later on when my son, Oliver, served here he was like an older brother. So I would like to express today our deep appreciation of his friendship, of his helpfulness, and of his stimulating example, of a strong patriotism that has meant much through the years. When Joe went into the Speaker's chair, how very proud and happy we Republicans were for him and for ourselves. What a privilege to serve under his leadership.

I found him always ready with such sound advice. He always thought of what the answer to the question I asked would do in my district. But also always as to the party, but most of all for the country that he loved.

Perhaps I will be misunderstood a little—but that does not matter to me—because I am rejoicing in Joe's release.

Death to me is an open door to new life, and I feel, with him, a wonderful preparation for further contributions to humanity—whether it is here on earth or whether it is far away.

So I would add my little word of joyous acceptance of his release, although I shall miss him—yes—but I shall not mourn that he has gone. I rejoice for him and I would suggest to all of us here in this House that there is something transcendently human for a man to serve as he has served and then to go out quietly into what to us is still unknown.

I join with my colleagues in sending my sympathy and understanding to those of his loved ones whom he has left behind. I rejoice that perhaps he has joined others over there.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BURKE].

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES], and I would like to join with my colleagues in this eulogy to one of the greatest Americans who ever lived, a man whose memory will live in the hearts of Americans and in the hearts of those who admire free government. His untimely passing has rendered a severe loss to the people of Massachusetts and the Nation.

Joe Martin was a close and dear friend of mine. His passing has saddened all of

us and is a personal loss to me as I had a genuine love and deep respect for him.

As the second child and eldest son of a blacksmith, Joe Martin always followed a pattern that he established in his youth: direct and friendly contact with the people he represented. From an early age, Joseph Martin was determined to serve the people. He was elected to Congress and served from 1925 to 1966. Time and time again, the people of his district, his State, and the Nation looked to Joe Martin to lead the way. Called Mr. Republican by his colleagues, he served as Speaker of the House during the 80th and 83d Congresses. But he looked upon his accomplishments with a distant pride. His closest interest lay in what he accomplished in the day-by-day, year-by-year march of events through Congress. I recall many, many days in this Congress when we sat side by side and discussed many of the problems, not only of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts but of the entire Nation and of the world.

Joe Martin was a giant of his times. He was like the old ancient Roman gladiator—always ready to meet the foe on equal terms, to fight him fairly, and to do the job in the way he felt was best.

He served in this body and he was a fine, dedicated, and devoted man. Uppermost in his mind at all times was those things he felt were in the best interest of the Nation.

I recall many occasions when the Massachusetts delegation met to discuss problems affecting their own local districts. Joe Martin was always there, helping out. He was a great man. He was a big man. I never recall one instance when Joe Martin ever said anything that would reflect disparagingly on this great body.

The memory of Joe Martin is the memory of one who was great in spirit and a man who, right down to his last days, was a man who gave all for his fellow man.

This House and the Nation has lost much in the passing of Joe Martin, and we stand greatly in debt to his memory as a devoted public servant in the kind of country he helped to build and preserve. With my other colleagues here, I extend my sympathy and my prayers to his beloved ones.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BELCHER].

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, I knew Joe Martin longer than I have known any single Member of this body. I met him in 1934 in Topeka, Kans., when he and I were both getting interested in the campaign of Alf Landon. I was a young Republican and Joe was at that time "Mr. Republican." He was the floor manager for Alf Landon. We worked together. Later, in 1941, I came down to Washington as administrative assistant to Ross Rizley who represented our district. We were very anxious to get Ross to become a member of the Committee on Agriculture. I had a great many contacts with Joe, and we were able to secure that seat.

Ten years later, in 1951, I came to Congress and I wanted a seat on the Agri-

culture Committee. Joe befriended me. He was the leader of our party, and I secured a seat on the Agriculture Committee.

Joe Martin was a warm friend. He was the type of man who got close to men. He was a great statesman. I always marvel at his relationship with the great Sam Rayburn. Many times I witnessed their skirmishes here. I saw them trade the gavel back and forth many times. I saw Sam Rayburn with tears streaming out of his eyes when Joe Martin was paying tribute to him.

When I came here, Sam was the Speaker. Joe was our leader. The Honorable JOHN MCCORMACK was the leader of the other side.

The House has not been the same to me since those two great men, Sam Rayburn and Joe Martin, have passed on. I do not think it ever will be the same. I have lost a very dear friend, the Nation has lost a great statesman, and I want to extend, along with my colleagues, my sympathy to Joe's beloved ones.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. Speaker, our hearts are heavy today at the news of the death of the Honorable Joseph W. Martin, Jr., a former Speaker of the House of Representatives and a distinguished Representative of the State of Massachusetts for 42 years.

In the history of our Nation there are men who go from this body to other, higher political offices of this land. To them go the attention of the Nation and the world.

Yet there are other men, equally talented and able, who chose to devote themselves to the House of Representatives. For them there is no siren song of ambition. To them, this body, where the voice of the people is most clearly heard, is the highest calling of national service.

Such a man was Joe Martin.

He devoted 42 years of his life to the people of his district and to the House of Representatives. His rise to national recognition and the House speakership was a gradual but progressive one.

His dedication, his wisdom, his strength of character marked him apart—and above—other men. Even those not of his political party and holding divergent views of national policy recognized well his abilities and his contribution to the Nation he loved so much.

It was my privilege to serve in the Congress, which Speaker Martin presided. He was consistently fair and tolerant with those of us in the minority and earned our respect and admiration.

The Republican Party has given our country a number of great leaders through its history. Lincoln and Teddy Roosevelt come readily to mind.

To that distinguished company today we must enter the name of Joseph W. Martin. He was a man who led his party yet never lost sight of the national interest because of partisanship.

He was powerful spokesman for a conservative philosophy who nonetheless

saw the need for much of the social welfare legislation of the New Deal and after. He was a staunch American who saw that the ultimate interests of the Nation demanded our assistance to both the war-ravaged nations of Europe and subsequently the developing countries of the world.

Mr. Speaker, the career of Joe Martin will remain fresh in our minds and the minds of all Americans as the years roll on. For in his life and his contribution to our society he represented a model of service and dedication to which we must compare our own efforts.

Longfellow once said that great men leave behind them "footprints in the sands of time." The path which Joseph W. Martin chose stretches before us. We can do no better than to follow after.

My wife joins me in extending sincere condolences to his family. Let us all be consoled that the good Lord has chosen him to be numbered among His very own.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, this is a very sad day for all who knew Joe Martin and for the United States. Joe was a great man, a humble man, a sincere man, and a warm, a very warm individual.

Those of us who have been privileged to know him through the years will remember 101 incidents that took place and will cherish his memory in many, many ways. My own fond recollection of the former Speaker goes back to the day when I was sworn into office after a special election in February 1950. I remember the first warm friendly hand which was extended to me was that of Speaker Joe. He put his arm around me and took me down to the well of the House, where the gentleman is now standing, and said, "Just remember this one thing: Many a man has committed suicide here. Never speak until you have something to say and you can back it up factually." It was very sound advice then, and it is certainly sound advice now.

When he spoke, we listened. We could believe his words and we could trust his intentions. More than that, we cannot ask of any one man. From the example he set as a man and as a legislator and as a leader, he bestowed a legacy from which all Americans can draw inspiration.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply saddened to learn of the death of former Speaker of the House Joseph M. Martin, of Massachusetts, whom I considered a dear friend and always a fine and courtly gentleman.

I shall never forget how kind and fair he was to me as a freshman Democrat in the 83d Congress. There were not many freshman Democrats in that Congress, and there were a lot of new Republican Members elected in the 1952 Eisenhower sweep; furthermore, Mr. Martin had many duties and responsibilities in con-

nection with the change in the operation of the House from Democratic to Republican control and then, a few weeks later, the changeover in the control of the national administration from Truman to Eisenhower. And he had had only 2 years' experience in the speakership from 1947 to 1949 in the 80th Congress. So he had every right to devote himself to the much more important problems which confronted him as Speaker and not worry about the problems of a brandnew freshman woman Democratic Member of this House.

Nevertheless, Speaker Martin went out of his way in many directions, and on many occasions, to help me in my work and to make me feel that, despite my many limitations, I could learn how to fulfill my obligations as a Member of the House and serve my constituents. He gave me added courage which I certainly needed at the time.

So, although I had not, of course, voted for Joe Martin for Speaker, because we had our own candidate for that position, I always felt that as Speaker he tried to be fair to all of us and to treat us as friends, as well as colleagues, devoted to the same ideals of patriotism and service to our country. He knew how to encourage and strengthen the newer Members, and he had the rare, warm qualities of brotherhood which prompted him to let his friendship for us always show through. Dignified as he was—and he was a very dignified gentleman—he never hesitated to let us know that we were his friends and that he loved us as we loved him. He was a fine man.

I extend my deep sympathy to his family.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I will speak very briefly to say I join all our colleagues who are taking time to pay tribute to a great American who has left his mark in history. Probably very few people in the history of the House will receive the kind and volume of tribute that he is receiving here today—and it is one that is deserved. Great as it is, however, I point out that whatever we may say and whatever will become part of the permanent record of special credit for him, it will be no match to the record he made and is already in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I would like to speak just briefly about an aspect of Joe Martin that has not been said with sufficient emphasis and that is he was a statesman.

The cause of his country was first. I recall, as a freshman, when we were having a difficult time here on the House floor, and things sort of got out of control. There was something very important, which dealt with foreign affairs, which President Eisenhower felt needed consideration and needed favorable action on the floor. Amendments were being adopted, and it was obvious that objective was not going to be reached. I sat here and saw then Speaker Rayburn come to talk to our then leader and heard him say, "Joe, our country is in trouble. You and I have got to get together." So they did. They took their turns in the well, and

they reversed the trend of what was going on in the legislative Halls, and our country's cause was served. So I pay tribute to him as a great statesman who served and made special contributions that designate him a truly great statesman who literally gave his life for his country.

I can also testify to his personal interest in me as a freshman, as many on both sides of the aisle have already testified. I remember particularly his telling me—and others no doubt—"as you earn your spurs here, remember if you want to be respected both here and at home you will have to do your homework. Do your homework and your future will be fairly secure." Joe Martin, the record shows, practiced what he preached "He too did his homework."

Mr. Speaker, Joe Martin is gone but the marks he made will remain forever. They are a part of our history and heritage. His achievement and his contributions are ours and they are for posterity. From his record we can learn, we can get sustenance we can and will grow, be statesmen and become great if we will always do our homework.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I served only 1 year with Joseph W. Martin, Jr., but my father and predecessor served with him for 27 of those 42 years Mr. Martin had here in the House. They were colleagues. And though they were occasional adversaries, they were always friends—friends with a depth of fondness for each other and for this body which can only grow from common beliefs, shared experiences, and mutual respect.

Joe Martin was on his way to leadership in this body when my father came to Congress with the Republican revival in 1938. He was the first great national figure in the Congress I remember meeting personally. As a young boy I can recall the thrill and awe I felt one evening when he dined at our home and I was privileged to stay up and listen to him and my predecessor discuss their philosophy, their legislative ideas, and their hopes for the Republican Party and the Nation.

Joe was a newspaperman and retained that interest through his career. Since it is a career also shared by my predecessor and me, I feel that it gave Joe Martin a perception and candor which made him a straight thinker and a good politician.

When he was no longer Speaker, Joe Martin gave the chair in which he sat behind that dais in this Chamber to my late father. Dad kept it until his own death, and I am now the proud possessor of it.

When youngsters were to come into dad's office he would sit them on the chair and say: "A great man used to sit in that chair, and his legs did not reach the floor, either. But when he stood up, he stood tall."

I said they were adversaries. Joe Martin was for Landon in 1936 and my father was for Frank Knox. But after the convention battle was over and the order was decided, they campaigned together in

that losing cause. That is the kind of political experience which makes for long friendships and interesting memories.

Total agreement is not the test of respect and affection. Joe Martin took his positions on what he thought was right, and he had to be a master strategist in this body because of the historic situation in which he found himself as minority leader and Speaker here. The affection in which he was held on both sides of the aisle attests to the fact he played the game straight just as he had played it hard in order to win the spot he will surely hold in history as he will in the hearts of his colleagues.

Whenever he stood up to be counted on anything, he did stand tall in this House. And he is standing tall wherever he is now. I really wish I could hear the conversations that he and my father are having now, because I know that they are together—perhaps not always in agreement, but together—colleagues as always and, as always, friends.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I want to add my voice to the many who have already paid tribute to a remarkable public servant, our beloved colleague Joseph W. Martin, Jr.

It was my good fortune to know Joe Martin, and to learn from him, from the very beginning of my years in Congress. During his years of service in this Chamber he gained the well-earned respect and affection of his colleagues, and an equally well-earned reputation as "Mr. Republican" within his own party.

I think it is tragic that we somehow save our finest tributes to men and reserve our praises for their qualities and accomplishments until their death. We always seem to be at a loss for an adequate response to the passing of men of the stature of Joe Martin.

I first heard of Joe Martin as a boy in Massachusetts. I heard of a blacksmith's son who had come to Congress from our State, full of youth and fire and a passion for truth.

When I came to the 86th Congress, I knew him as a man unrivaled in the history of this Nation as a true champion of the causes he felt were right for his country.

Joe Martin sat in the House for 42 years, and was its Republican leader for 20 of those years. He was Speaker of the House for 4 years and chairman of five Republican National Conventions.

The spirit of Joe Martin will remain in this Chamber long after the man is gone, but his memory will serve as an inspiration to all members of his party—and all patriotic Americans of all parties—for many years to come.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, all of us, regardless of party, are saddened by the death of Joseph W. Martin, Jr., who served the House of Representatives with such distinction during most of my service in the Congress.

He was a great statesman. Although he was a dedicated and distinguished leader of his party, he never lost sight of the national interest, and always placed our national security above considerations of party politics.

I regard it as a privilege to have served with him in the House. Those of us who

knew him will always retain fond memories of him. His name will live in history.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, America lost one of its great sons and the Congress one of its most distinguished former Members yesterday, with the death of our beloved former Speaker, the Honorable Joseph W. Martin.

Joe Martin was a great person and a memorable character, whose service to his country was marked by many legislative achievements. In the memory of more than half of our country, he was the only Republican who has served as Speaker of the House of Representatives in recent times.

All who served in the House during Speaker Martin's terms as Speaker will surely remember him for his fairness, his good humor, and his consideration for his colleagues in both political parties.

It was a privilege to serve with this great American, and a pleasure to know him as a friend.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to say a few words about an old friend—Joe Martin. When I came to the 88th Congress I soon learned to know one man loved by all. He was still referred to by many as "Mr. Speaker." When the going got rough, his words were listened to by all. He spoke seldom—but when he did—the Hall was silent for we all wanted the benefit of his wisdom.

When new Members needed counsel Joe Martin was available. You could see members of both parties slip into the seat beside him—get a friendly smile—and absorb his words of wisdom.

Others can and have spoken of his earlier days here. I can only speak of his golden years; but I can testify that these were most productive—and good for the people of the Nation. The people of generations to come—as well as those of today are better for his having passed this way.

As a younger Member of this body, Mr. Speaker, I can truly say—we loved him, we admired him, we respected him.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, all of us are saddened by the passing of our former colleague, the Honorable Joseph W. Martin, Jr. Even though he was no longer serving in this Chamber, his spirit has been with us in all that we have done.

I had the privilege of serving 4 years with Joe Martin, and it was a wonderful experience to work with him and to have him for a friend. His efforts were untiring, and he was always dedicated to getting the legislative job done in the most effective manner. As a friend, one could always rely upon him being right where he was most needed.

Joe Martin played a very prominent part in the Republican National Conventions and always performed nobly and well. He was known for his fairness and for his dedication to principle in these convention proceedings. He has left a record in convention halls that will always prove difficult to emulate.

Joe Martin held many high political posts in his lifetime, one of these being the Speaker of the House of Representatives. His was a life that was meaning-

ful and expansive, and as he gave unselfishly of himself in public service, so has the American society benefited.

While Joe Martin has left our presence, his memories will remain—he was truly a great statesman, a wonderful human being, and a friend.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, this country has received a great loss in the passing of former Speaker Joe Martin, a great gentleman and a great American. He was a personal friend of each of us and he left a legacy to all the American people in the constructive legislation which he sponsored and directed. The affection felt by Members of Congress for him was partly the result of his great ability, but more because of his warm human qualities. As paradoxical as it may seem, in my own instance a part of my affection for him was due to the small accidental errors which he occasionally made. They were not important but they tended to emphasize the really important things about him. He was not bothered with trifles and he showed little concern for himself. He recalls for me the saying of Ralph Waldo Emerson: "See how the masses of man worry themselves into nameless graves, while here and there some noble soul forgets himself into immortality."

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, the people of Massachusetts and Americans everywhere have sustained a great loss in the passing of our distinguished former Speaker, the Honorable Joseph W. Martin, Jr. With his death the Nation has lost an elder statesman whose outstanding record of public service covered more than half a century.

Born in North Attleboro, Mass., on November 3, 1884, and educated in his native State, Joseph W. Martin became a successful newspaper publisher before entering public service. On his election to the Massachusetts State House of Representatives in 1912 he embarked upon a career of public service to the people of his State and Nation which will long be remembered as exemplifying the very finest of American ideals.

From March 4, 1925, when he took his seat in the House of Representatives, until the day he retired from the House, the career of Joseph W. Martin was exemplified by his devotion to duty and the best interests of his State and Nation. He was a kind, gentle, and able man. All those who had the privilege to share his friendship came to admire and respect his sterling virtues.

Our late Speaker lived and labored through a great era in the history of his Nation. This country is a much better place in which to live and work by reason of the dedicated service of Joe Martin. He has passed from the earthly scene of his many accomplishments, but he shall long be remembered as one of the great Americans of his age.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, it is with great regret and sorrow that I learned of the passing of our very distinguished former colleague, Joe Martin. When I first came to Congress in 1943, Mr. Martin was then a veteran of 20 years service, and I shall always remember his warm welcome to me, his patience, his gracious attitude and courteous consideration to new Members of Congress.

He had a warm and sympathetic personality and seemed never too busy to share problems with his colleagues. As Speaker of the House, Mr. Martin served with dignity and dedication, but he kept on the same friendly terms with Members of Congress that he had previously enjoyed. I am happy to have had the privilege to know and to serve with this fine gentleman, who has passed to his eternal reward.

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a sad moment which calls me to speak today. It was with deep grief that I learned this morning of the death of my good friend and former colleague, Joe Martin. One of the highest privileges of my life was to serve in this body with him. Like all of those who have been enriched by knowing him, I can speak only in the highest terms of his dedication to his country, his State, and the Republican Party.

Joe Martin began his long career in public life in 1911 when he was elected to the Massachusetts Legislature. In 1924 he came to the House of Representatives where over a period of 42 years of loyal and enthusiastic service he rose to positions of influence and national prominence. He was leader of the Republican Party in the House for 20 years, Speaker of the House for 4 years, five times the chairman of Republican National Conventions, and national chairman of the Republican Party from 1940 to 1942. His labor on behalf of his party was tireless. It was Joe Martin who was chairman of the congressional campaign that started the Republican Party back toward power in the House of Representatives for the first time in almost 20 years. No man in this century has better deserved the title of "Mr. Republican."

I am proud of his dedicated service to the Nation, the State of Massachusetts, and to the Republican Party. Speaker Martin will long be remembered in the Halls of Congress and throughout America with the greatest respect, affection and gratitude.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in expressing sorrow over the death of the Honorable Joseph Martin, former Speaker of the House of Representatives. His death ends an illustrious career of a truly great and dedicated American.

Although our political views differed, we were good personal friends. He was most willing at all times to do a personal favor for a colleague whenever he possibly could.

Joe Martin was held in esteem and respect by all of his colleagues and by all who knew him. His name will live in history as one of the most respected and able political leaders of our time. He shared a close friendship with former Speaker Sam Rayburn and with our distinguished Speaker, the Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK.

Joseph Martin was a staunch Republican who had a long tenure in the House of Representatives including many years as his party's leader. Yet he always enjoyed the admiration, respect, and friendship of his Democratic colleagues. On many occasions they paid him glowing tributes.

The Republican Party has lost a great leader. The Nation has lost one of her greatest statesmen.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, it was with a feeling of personal loss and deep sorrow that I, this morning, learned of the death of our friend and former colleague, the Honorable Joseph W. Martin, Jr., of Massachusetts. A great era in U.S. history draws to a close with his death. It was a privilege for me to be part of the Speaker Rayburn-Speaker Martin era here in the U.S. House of Representatives.

The people of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts have indeed been fortunate in having such men as Joe Martin and our present Speaker McCORMACK representing them. Joe Martin was first elected to the 69th Congress, which convened on March 4, 1925, beginning 42 years of labor on behalf of those who had sent him here and for the principles of his party. His integrity, his word as his bond, and devotion to his party were legendary. Even though we were on opposite sides of the aisle and had many differences of opinion, those differences in no way diminished my admiration and respect for Joe.

While there are physical monuments in honor of Speaker Martin, no great legislative accomplishments bear his name. However, anyone who takes this as a sign that Joe's years of service were unfruitful in this regard is laboring under great disillusionment. His accomplishments and successes will not be found in the history books but in the hard fought battles of the legislative process which brought about the enactment of the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the United States is a better place because Joe Martin passed through and gave unstintingly of his talents. All of us who had the privilege of knowing Joe Martin as a friend and as a colleague will miss him but we shall cherish the memories he gave us. The surviving members of his family have my deepest sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, all Members of the House, on both sides of the aisle, are saddened today by the news of former Speaker Joseph W. Martin's death.

The House was his life, and the gentleman from Massachusetts will be long remembered for the dedication, patriotism, and humanity which he brought to it. He served with distinction in this Chamber for 42 years—longer than any Republican except Speaker Joseph G. Cannon—and was House leader of his party for 20 years. He also served his party as chairman of five Republican National Conventions and as chairman of the Republican National Committee.

A generous and resourceful man, Joseph Martin turned down a scholarship to Dartmouth College to become a newspaper reporter. Years later he bought his hometown newspaper, the North Attleboro, Mass., Evening Chronicle, and financed Dartmouth educations for two brothers. He was subsequently awarded an honorary Dartmouth degree.

As an alumnus of Dartmouth and a friend of the Martin brothers, I recall with pride their contributions to Dartmouth, to the fourth estates of Connecti-

cut and Massachusetts, and, of course, to the Congress of the United States.

Joseph Martin has been a key figure in the House of Representatives in this century. His former colleagues, and fellow Americans, mourn his passing.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, one of the great political figures of our time has gone to his reward and those of us who were his friends and served in Congress under his leadership cannot help but mourn his passing although he had an unusually long and useful life.

Joe Martin was like an old shoe. You could not help but feel comfortable with him. Even when I first became a Member of the House, and he was Speaker, he was never aloof. He was always approachable and no Member of either party no matter who you were, or how long you had been in Congress but received patient and courteous attention. No request for help but had his sympathetic consideration.

While he and the Democratic leaders, especially Sam Rayburn, worked closely together, everyone had reason to know he was a firm and unwavering Republican and believed deeply in the philosophy of his party.

Joe always stayed close to "his troops." He sat at the Republican roundtable at lunch and so it was freshmen Congressmen and those of us who were rank and file had the benefit of his friendship and learned to respect his wisdom and character. He was always straightforward and frank and would never misrepresent facts.

Mr. Speaker, I admired Joe Martin. One of the great privileges of my political life was knowing him and serving under him.

During his latter years in the House when it was obvious that physically he was failing, it was heartwarming to see him carry on gallantly—old war horse that he was.

Since his retirement I often thought of Joe and only the other day inquired about him and his whereabouts. Now I will not write that letter I planned, but as long as I am still around I will never forget Joe and will carry with me fond recollections of one of the finest Americans I have ever known—Speaker Joe Martin.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply grieved to learn of the passing of our beloved friend, Speaker Joe Martin.

For years he was an outstanding figure on the American political scene. He rose from humble beginnings to the very high position of Speaker of the House of Representatives, one of the most exalted positions of honor and power in the land.

His career was marked by extraordinary devotion to the public interest, and his long, sustained work to strengthen and advance our great country in every sense, not only economically and socially, but spiritually as well, will long be remembered by a grateful nation. His accomplishments for his constituents, for his state and nation were so numerous and so noteworthy that I could not even begin to mention them in these remarks.

Joe Martin worked his way to the top largely by his own efforts and the support of loyal friends, who had confidence in his ability and high purpose. He was

conservative by nature, but quick to perceive that which was best for the country and was willing to adapt himself to meet new situations and new problems.

He was strong and rugged in his convictions, but always open to argument, reason and persuasion and willing to reach a consensus. He was strong of character, and followed rigid principles of honesty, industry and loyalty to his friends. He believed that hard work every day was indispensable to achievement.

He was widely known and frequently consulted by other leaders, businessmen, educators, and constituents because of his faculty of measuring public questions, indeed everything that was presented to him, in terms of sound, commonsense and solid judgment, based on experience rather than theory. He was trusted and respected for his sound, sensible, practical views.

Many Members of this House on both sides of the aisle frequently consulted with our genial and beloved Joe and found him a kind of catalyst in shaping their own opinions.

I should say that perhaps the predominating thing about Joe Martin as a public figure was his intense patriotism and love of this country which always seemed to me to be a very part of his nature, an automatic, instinctive reaction.

While he was a vigorous, militant, partisan when the occasion required it, and greatly honored by his party, he was never a partisan when the cause of his country was concerned or when friendship was involved.

When he was Speaker, as he was on two occasions, time and time again, he came eagerly to the aid of the President not of his own party, and he worked loyally with his dear friend, our great and beloved, Speaker McCORMACK, then majority leader, when great national issues were at stake, and he did so with wholeheartedness and determination that left no doubt as to where he stood.

His career in Congress spanned some 42 years in the history of the United States, during which the Nation and the world were shot through with war, social unrest, and great changes in the political and social order.

Through it all, whatever turn the wheel of fortune took, Joe Martin took his position, fought for it as best he could, and imperturbably scanned the scene to see what more he could do to help the country and the people.

I have many precious, personal recollections of Joe Martin, who was one of the finest men I have ever known in or out of politics, but the one I think most indelibly impressed on my memory is of him some years ago while presiding over the House, on the day that the Puerto Rican nationalists entered the Gallery and fired pistol shots in all directions. At the time, naturally, there was great excitement and alarm, but on the whole, considering what was happening surprisingly calm reaction.

Many of the Members were standing around looking at the gallery to see what was happening, and when they realized what the situation was, quickly dove into nearby shelters to escape the fusillade of

shots that sprinkled the Chamber, and left their marks on the desks, seats, walls, and ceiling.

Several Members were seriously shot during this incredible affair, and it was only by the grace of God that many on the floor at the time were not killed.

I had stepped out of the House to answer a call, and when I returned to my seat, one which I occupy 99 percent of the time I am present in the House, it was occupied by my dear and distinguished friend, Hon. Cliff Davis of Tennessee, who offered immediately to give it up to me.

Of course, I declined and sat a few seats off the aisle just ahead of my regular seat. Regrettably, during the fracas, Congressman Davis was struck, although fortunately his injuries were not serious. Only the intercessions of my guardian angel spared me that day.

Meanwhile, through all the turmoil, Joe Martin on the rostrum presiding over the House, had taken his gavel and retreated to a point directly behind his chair, adjacent to one of the large columns where he might have some protection from the bullets, and was reaching out pounding the gavel, demanding that the House come to order.

This was an example not only of the raw courage, but of the keen, alert mind which Joe Martin possessed.

Joe Martin was a very generous and amiable person. He was a good, loyal friend to very many people, and beamed with good nature and friendliness.

He was also a willing counselor, and always had time to listen to younger Members' problems and give them a word of advice and, if necessary, some help.

During the latter years of his service in the House, after he had retired from the speakership, he used to sit right across the aisle from my own seat and that of the able, distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, our esteemed friend, Mr. DONOHUE and, of course, we saw a great deal of him and frequently had the opportunity to exchange views with him.

On many occasions we also flew back and forth between Boston and Washington with him.

Our loss is indeed great and the country's loss is very great, because we have lost one of the greatest Americans of our time. Speaker Martin has left an illustrious record in these halls which has been indelibly written into the history of our country, and which will long be remembered as an example of stalwart, unflinching Americanism. He was an honest, able, faithful public servant, marked by constant, unceasing concern for his district, his State, his country, and the American people.

Joe Martin will be widely mourned and greatly missed, and with deepest grief, I join his bereaved family in their sorrow, and in mourning this great American and dear friend, who has served our country so faithfully and so well, and has left us all such a rich heritage of dedicated statesmanship and devotion to the Nation.

My heart goes out to Joe Martin's bereaved family, to whom he was so deeply and dearly devoted, and I extend to all of them my deepest, most pro-

found sympathy for the great, irreparable loss they have sustained, which is, indeed, the loss of all of us who knew Joe Martin.

A great, a good man, a gentle, modest man, a great American leader, a dearly beloved friend had laid down his burdens and responded to the final rollcall of the Divine Master.

May the good Lord bless and keep him forever.

And may this great Speaker and dear friend find rest and peace in his eternal home.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of Joe Martin, this country has lost one of its finest sons.

It was my honor and privilege to have served with this eloquent gentleman in this House of Representatives. Joe Martin distinguished himself as Speaker and as minority leader of this body for many long and productive years. Anyone who had the good fortune to meet him was soon aware of his exceptional capabilities as a legislator and statesman. He was blessed with the ability to be a keen observer, and yet at the same time be an active participant.

Joe Martin had as many friends as any one I can remember. He was a close personal friend of the late Speaker Sam Rayburn, and just about everybody on Capitol Hill. I know that my sorrow at hearing of his death is shared by all my colleagues, and by the Nation.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, as a representative of the youngest State of the Union, I rise to pay tribute to the memory of a former Member of this House, the late Joseph William Martin, Jr., who gave the greater part of his life to the service of his country and to his State which is one of the oldest in the Nation.

As one who lived in Cambridge, Mass., for 3 years, while a student at Harvard Law School, I have always had a warm spot in my heart for the people of Massachusetts. For this reason I sought the friendship of the former Speaker at the earliest opportunity during my first term in Congress. He impressed me deeply with his warm personality and friendliness. He expressed his pride in having played a part in granting statehood to Hawaii, and in the fact that his State of Massachusetts had played a major role in the early history of Hawaii.

Joe Martin has left an indelible mark in this Nation's legislative history. His forthright speech, devotion to duty, and integrity of character will long be remembered. In the true American tradition, he came from humble beginnings and rose to enviable heights, an able and highly respected statesman.

It is almost impossible to speak of Joe Martin's record as a public servant without also mentioning his steadfast loyalty to the party of his political allegiance. He discharged the duties of his elective office to the best of his ability, but he served his party as only a true leader can.

This Nation is richer for having had Joe Martin as a citizen.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the boundaries of the world that I have known narrowed when I read in the morning newspaper of the passing of a

great and beloved American, the Honorable Joseph William Martin, Jr. Joe Martin and I were not too far apart in years, he being my junior by some 2 years. When I was Lieutenant Governor of Illinois he was a member of the State house of representatives in Massachusetts and while I was still serving as president of the senate in Illinois Joe Martin had moved to the senate of the State of Massachusetts. Long had he been famous, his name a household word throughout the Nation, one of the great figures in the Republican Party when I came to the Congress. He had served as Speaker in the 80th Congress, and when I arrived here in the 81st Congress he was the ex-Speaker, the minority leader, and the idol of all Republicans everywhere. It was my great privilege to serve as a Member of the House when he was its Speaker in the 83d Congress. He was considerate at all times. He was kindly in every way and I have sweet memories of so many very nice things that he did for me when he was the Republican Speaker and I was a relatively new Member on the Democratic side. Through the years after that we remained close and warm friends and I was heartbroken when he left the Congress.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, one of the privileges of serving as a U.S. Representative is the privilege of getting to know some of the greatest leaders and patriots of our time. Today, we honor the memory of a man who was not only a great leader and patriot in our present time, but one who will rank among the greatest Americans of all time. Known as "Joe" to everyone, the late Joseph W. Martin, Jr., stamped an indelible mark on his Nation and this House.

Compared to Joe Martin's 42 years in this body, my 10 years on the scene stamp me as a Johnny-come-lately, but it was my privilege to have served with him and to have benefited greatly from his example and counsel.

I recall the death of another great leader, the late Senator Robert Taft, of Ohio. He was called "Mr. Republican." We in the House have had our own "Mr. Republican" and he was Joe Martin. While always putting the welfare of the entire Nation first, he nonetheless rebuilt the Republican Party during the thirties, becoming a moving force in the art of minority politics.

The Republican Party and this House was his life, and in return he was given many honors. He was our Republican leader for 20 years, Speaker of the House for 4, was the chairman of the Republican National Committee as well as chairman of the Republican congressional campaign committee. He chaired five Republican National Conventions.

None will forget Joe Martin's performance at his last national convention at San Francisco's Cow Palace in 1956, when a delegate tried to nominate "Joe Smith" for Vice President. A newspaper article this morning reminded me of the bedlam that followed, and Joe Martin's voice rising above the melee shouting "Take your Joe Smith and get outta here." The nonexistent Joe Smith henceforth became part of political folklore.

I am also reminded of the story about the late Speaker Sam Rayburn, who was once asked to campaign against his friend Joe Martin. Rayburn, although on the other side of the political fence, reportedly refused, snorting: "If I lived in his district I'd vote for him."

Joe Martin was fiercely loyal, and he was trusted and liked by Republicans and Democrats alike. He was a real pro who instinctively knew what had to be done and then went ahead and did it. We here today stand most humbly in his shadow, being careful to give sincere thanks for the privilege of knowing Joseph William Martin, Jr., late a Representative from Massachusetts.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, with all my fellow Members here, I am deeply saddened to learn of the passing of my dear friend, our former colleague and Speaker of this House, the Honorable Joseph W. Martin, Jr., of Massachusetts. This Nation and the world is grateful that, for a period of 42 years, divine providence afforded us the unique genius of his patriotic dedication, guidance and perseverance in the fight for freedom's preservation and expansion through many of the most difficult periods of decision that civilized existence has thus far experienced.

In the darkest and gravest hours of legislative challenge in this Chamber, all of us have witnessed the indomitable spirit of this mighty man enlighten and encourage this body toward the patriotic discharge of our full and common responsibility.

Considering the universally acclaimed record of this great and good man throughout 42 years of devoted service in the Congress, I believe it is safe to prophesize that his legislative learning, knowledge, wisdom, and guidance will forever remain unsurpassed in the annals of congressional accomplishment.

Within himself, and by his own industry and competence, Speaker Joe Martin became a national institution in our American political life. He presided over this House with absolute fairness and integrity, and his encouragement, through wise counsel and sympathetic cooperation, to all Members irrespective of party, will remain a byword in this Chamber forever.

Joe Martin is unquestionably one of the most distinguished Americans of all time. However, above and beyond all other things, he was beloved by all who ever knew him anywhere for his humble attitude, his neighborly disposition, his patient tolerance, his compassionate understanding, and his quiet humor, his genuine friendship and his kindly heart. The legend of his great and generous spirit can never be removed from the atmosphere of this Chamber.

His personal example provides for all of us here, and those who will come after, a permanent inspiration of patriotic service for which this Nation will never cease to be indebted to him.

He will be sorely missed by everyone privileged to know him.

In this time of great loss and sorrow we extend our heartfelt sympathy to his bereaved sisters, brother, nephew, and other family members, while we join in

our prayers that the soul of our beloved, departed friend rests in heavenly peace.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, every one of us who knew Joe Martin feels saddened today by the passing of our good friend.

One of the rewards of serving as a Member of Congress over the past several years has been to know the former Speaker and to have a feeling that he was our friend. While it was not my privilege to serve with him in the days when he was Speaker, it was my privilege to be with him when he was ranking minority member of the Science and Astronautics Committee, or the House Space Committee.

It was as a fellow member of this committee that I learned to know him. I will cherish those days forever. He was a man of long and rich experience, but he was not selfish. He was one who was willing to share the benefits of that experience with others.

Our days together on committee were in the early days of the space program. Those times were filled with the excitement of the first Mercury shots and then the early Gemini shots. While he was not always present because of his health, he was there on those important occasions when his presence was necessary to report bills which were so important to our early and always successful efforts in space.

He was a man who was willing to give a fellow member advice if you asked for it. Always I found his counsel was not only helpful but of inestimable value. To serve as a good member of a committee his advice in essence was, as has been expressed here by others, in the form of an admonition—"do your homework."

On the subject of debate on the floor between colleagues, his advice was "Always be sure of your facts but once you have possession of the facts, do not give up a fight." Joe Martin was a fighter. But he was a fighter who was extremely fair to an opponent. I am sure he never took advantage of an opponent, political or otherwise.

Joe Martin was a man who believed that if you could not say something that was constructive, or something to make a contribution to the debate of an issue, then it was best to remain silent. He was not a sniper or a wrecker. He was not a man who wanted to tear things down. Instead, he was a builder.

Our departed friend lived a life guided by his creed that in order to have friends, one must be a friend. He was a true friend. That is why today a host of friends mourn his passing. All of his colleagues will remember him as a kind and considerate man. On this sad occasion, our deepest sympathy goes to his loved ones.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in sadness and with heavy heart in participating in this eulogy for our beloved former colleague, Joseph W. Martin, Jr.

I have known no one in public life whom I have admired more, who was more kind, congenial, considerate, and gentle. As a freshman Member in 1955, and as my minority leader, he took time from his busy life to counsel, to encourage, and to assist.

Joe Martin found time to come to my district on a number of occasions and in so doing not only demonstrated his devotion to public service but had demonstrated to him the affection of thousands of people throughout the country who held him in such high esteem.

Joe Martin was a Congressman's Congressman. He was a legislative statesman whose ability and knowledge were grounded in years of public service and acceptance of party responsibility, starting with state legislative service, through chairmanship of the Republican National Committee, permanent chairman of the Republican National Conventions, minority leader and reaching the legislative pinnacle of Speaker of the greatest and most influential legislative body in the world.

I am proud to pay tribute to a most outstanding American who left a great heritage and who made the United States a better Nation because of his service. Joe will be missed by all of us, by his legions of friends, but the knowledge that he has gone to his just reward in Heaven makes the sorrow of his passing more bearable.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, we are all saddened by the death of our friend and former colleague, Joseph W. Martin. We of the Massachusetts delegation feel the loss even more deeply because we knew him so well, and had known him so long.

It is hard to say how I remember Joe Martin. I remember him here on the floor of this House, in the cloakroom, and at formal and informal gatherings wherever Congressmen met, as a stocky, broad-shouldered man with a shock of black hair that often fell into his face as he talked. He had an open, friendly face. His life was politics, and he was interested in every phase and every field of politics. To him it was a proud profession, and he spent his life in its service.

I think I always remember him most, however, as he welcomed me, a new and unknown Member of this House, from a part of the State far from his own Attleboro, to the 83d Congress. He was the Speaker of the House then, but he found the time to be friendly, kind, considerate, and helpful to me, a member of a different party. He treated everyone that way, I later found out, and perhaps that was the source of his greatest strength among us.

Whether a man agreed or disagreed with Joe Martin, he had to respect him and trust him, for he was a man of his word and of unswerving high principles. We all remember him as a hard and fair fighter, and a man who put his duty to his country well above any personal or partisan considerations.

He did this with the greatest respect for partisan politics, for he knew, as we all do, that this is the foundation of good government and of the American way of life. The two-party system was never stronger than under his guidance and leadership.

To all of us here in this House, he was a friend and an inspiration. To those of us who were his political neighbors in Massachusetts, he was a valued personal friend, and we were all proud to be his

colleague. His place in our hearts will never be filled.

An editorial published March 7 in the Springfield, Mass., Daily News outlines the contributions this remarkable man made to his party and to his country. I include this editorial in the RECORD at this point:

JOE MARTIN

Joe Martin belongs to another political age.

It was an age of the individual party stalwart in which the personal imprint shaped and dominated political philosophies in both Republican and Democratic ranks. It was an age which saw one of its last great practitioners in the person of Joseph W. Martin Jr., who for years was "Mr. Republican."

A review of the record of Joe Martin's 42 years in Congress will of course note that he was twice House speaker, GOP floor leader for some 20 years, and five times chairman of Republican national conventions. In 1948, his name was prominently mentioned as a dark horse candidate for the presidential nomination.

This, however, is only part of the record. Joe Martin's political talents were perhaps secondary to the dedication and integrity that he brought to his job—from his election to the Massachusetts House in 1912, to his more than four decades in Congress, to his departure from the Washington scene in 1966.

It can be said that the pressure of fast-paced politics and advancing years wrote the final chapter in this story. In 1959, Republicans installed a younger man as GOP House leader. After that, it was only a matter of time until Mr. Martin would lose his congressional seat. The defeat came, unceremoniously, at the hands of a young housewife in a primary.

Joe Martin accepted the inevitable graciously, reflecting the wisdom of his long political years. "You can't win them all," he said. "I can forget the losses when I think of the successes."

Now Joe Martin is dead, at the age of 83. He was "Mr. Republican." But, even more, his outstanding service to his party made him a politician-statesman for all the people.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in paying tribute to the great and distinguished former Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Honorable Joseph W. Martin, Jr., who was a grand and wonderful man, dedicated and patriotic.

Joe Martin loved his country and its ideals. He served long in the Halls of this House of Congress and his love and devotion to this House grew with each day of service. He was forever ready throughout my years of service in the House of Representatives to be cooperative and encouraging. His rulings were fair and just and even when partisan spirit ran high he rendered justice according to law. His many fine qualities of kindness and helpfulness to young Members of Congress will never be forgotten. He will always have a high place in the history of his country. His character, his achievements, and his faithful service will be an inspiration to generations yet to come.

Mr. Martin's abilities could be extolled at length, but I feel I can pay no worthier tribute than to express my sincere conviction that our country and our lives are infinitely richer because Joe Martin lived and served.

Here truly was a man who gave of himself to the service of his fellow man.

He has left a legacy for all of us—his own high official and personal standards, so consistently maintained, to which we all must aspire now and in the future.

May the perpetual light shine upon him and his noble soul rest in peace.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, a voice that has spoken so long and well for the citizens of these United States has been stilled. This Nation will long mourn the passing of Joseph William Martin, Jr.

We who served with Joe Martin, Jr., were fortunate indeed. By both his example and advice, he directed our footsteps along the path of sound legislative practice. When I entered this body as a freshman in 1951, I sought for guidance. I soon learned that I could always go to that leader for aid in the fulfillment of my duties. He gave as much of his time to a freshman Congressman as to one of many years of service.

No greater patriot has ever served the U.S. House of Representatives. His every waking hour was devoted to the welfare of his fellow citizens. His great legal ability was always at the service of us all. The legislation that he sponsored, directed or aided in passing has made our Nation greater and finer. I know to Joe Martin that these legislative acts were the only monument that he would wish but we who loved and respected him so dearly hope that we can honor him in a more demonstrative manner.

The former Speaker and minority leader of the House was a kindly and good man who not only believed in the brotherhood of man but lived a life of brotherhood.

The integrity and ability that Joe Martin brought to his daily tasks will be sorely missed by us all. His deep devotion to the U.S. House of Representatives was known to us all and he instilled that same desire of service to that body in many of us who mourn him today.

Mr. Speaker, we are a greater nation because of the services of former Speaker Joseph William Martin, Jr. Our loss is indeed great but we are grateful for the many years that he gave us.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the people of Massachusetts and Americans everywhere have sustained a great loss in the passing of our distinguished former Speaker, the Honorable Joseph W. Martin, Jr. With his death, the Nation has lost an elder statesman whose outstanding record of public service covered more than half a century.

From March 4, 1925, when he took his seat in the House of Representatives, until the day he retired from the House, the career of Joseph W. Martin was exemplified by his devotion to duty and the best interests of his State and Nation. He was a kind, gentle, and able man. All those who had the privilege to share his friendship came to admire and respect his sterling virtues.

Joe Martin was a loyal party man but he believed in the two-party system and contributed to its strength. For this, he earned the respect of all Members on both sides of the aisle.

Our late Speaker lived and labored through a great era in the history of our Nation and our country is a better place in which to live and work by reason of

the dedicated service of Joe Martin. He has passed from the earthly scene of his many accomplishments, but he will long be remembered as one of the great Americans of his age. His personal example provides for all of us here, and those who will come after, a permanent inspiration for the type of patriotic service for which this Nation will never cease to be indebted to him.

In this time of great loss and sorrow, we extend our heartfelt sympathy to his bereaved sisters, brother, nephew, and other family members.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, Joe Martin's life was devoted to the service of his country under the auspices of the Republican Party since the time he marched as a boy in a torchlight parade in honor of William McKinley. He served 42 years in the House of Representatives, beginning with the 69th Congress. He was Speaker of the House for two terms—the 80th and the 83d Congresses. He was the minority leader in the House five times—in the 77th, 78th, 81st, 82d, and 84th Congresses. He was elected the permanent chairman of the Republican National Convention four times—1940, 1944, 1948, 1952—and he served two terms as chairman of the Republican National Committee—in 1940 and 1942. He was not an orator with a persuasive tongue, but he had an uncanny political sense which commanded the attention and respect of everyone. He was loved by many, and as his great rival and close friend, Speaker Sam Rayburn, once remarked when he was asked to campaign against him:

Hell, if I lived in his district, I would vote for him.

Joe Martin was one of the first to learn about the plans for the Capitol Hill Club. He not only subscribed to it immediately, but as the leader of the Republican Party, he secured the aid of many influential Republicans. He headed the committee that raised a substantial sum for the Douglas MacArthur Memorial Wing.

His devotion to the Republican Party and his deep loyalty to his beloved country will always be an inspiration to those who enjoyed the privilege of his friendship. Our Nation today misses his clear and honest analytical thinking as well as his political acumen, but nonetheless we are a better and a stronger people because of his unselfish and devoted service.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, we are all deeply sorry that our friend Joe Martin has left us. But we know that he has indeed gone to the happy hunting ground for he was a chieftain, par excellence, a leader who was at the same time a friend to Republican and Democrat alike. Joe enjoyed the deepest respect and affection of his colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

In 1952 I had the privilege to be with him at the Republican National Convention. He was chairman. I was a lowly assistant sergeant at arms. But you would never know this from Joe. To one and all he had the common touch, friendly, humble, sincere, dedicated, a man of the people and yet a man who could be depended upon to lead with inspiration

and devotion to principle. He was a practical man, who knew what had to be accomplished and worked indefatigably at it until it was done.

In a sense our late Speaker was Mr. Republican. He carried this reputation proudly for most of his life. He was solid—a real guy—constructive, serious, hard working, whose contributions over a lifetime represent a record of devoted public service that few Americans have equalled in the entire history of this proud Nation.

Joe Martin was a great American who conscientiously served his country and his people in accordance with his high personal standards and with outstanding capability. As one who respected and admired him I can think of no higher compliment than to have it said of me by one who knew, that "he was Joe Martin's friend."

Mr. Speaker, we shall miss him. America will miss him. Let us reflect in the words of that great poet:

He is not dead. He is just away. With a cheery smile and a wave of the hand he has gone to visit some unknown land.

We salute Joe Martin, one and all.

Mr. McCLODY. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to serve during the 88th and 89th Congresses with the late Speaker of the House of Representatives, Joseph W. Martin, Jr., of Massachusetts.

Prior to my coming to the Congress in 1962, I became aware of the statesman-like qualities and public and party leadership exemplified so capably by Joe Martin. Long years of service, diligent application to his duties, and impeccable qualities of morality and loyalty were combined with his political and legislative talents to carry him to the great heights which he attained.

It is always sad to note the passing of a friend and colleague, and in this hour, it is particularly sad because of Joe Martin's great stature as a political and public figure. At the same time it seems appropriate to express gratitude that Joe Martin could endow this great legislative body with the indelible impression of his character. The firm and resonant tones of his great voice and the high principles which he embodied in all that he did and said have left an immortal imprint on the Congress of the United States. Joe Martin helped to elevate the reputation of the U.S. Congress by bringing honor and respect to this body in all that he accomplished and all that he represented during his 40 years of public service in the U.S. House of Representatives.

I am proud to join today at this time of great public sorrowing and to express with all humility and sincerity my affection and respect for the late Joseph W. Martin, Jr., of Massachusetts.

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I join with everyone in the Congress and a multitude of admirers throughout the Nation in paying tribute to our departed friend and former colleague—one of the great Americans of his time—Joe Martin.

It was my privilege to serve in the House with the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts for 4 years. Many of you knew him longer, of course; but when

he welcomed me on my first day as a Member of Congress, I felt that we were friends of long standing. Indeed, Joe Martin was almost legendary in national politics, for his name and fame were well known in every State. As a leader in his party and the Congress, he brought to Government that rare and marvelous talent for combining warmth, simplicity, and understanding with wisdom and dignity which transcended partisanship; and he leaves a legacy which is a source of inspiration and encouragement for all of us.

I feel honored to have known and served with him even briefly. He leaves a richer nation behind, and he has earned his rightful place in history. I join in extending heartfelt sympathy to all members of his family.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, permit me to join with my colleagues from Massachusetts and others in paying a brief but sincere tribute to the memory of our late colleague and friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts, Speaker Joseph W. Martin.

During my first term in this body Joe Martin was our Speaker. This was during the 80th Congress. Speaker Martin received me in a kind, gracious manner, and I have always been grateful to him for his kindness and consideration showed me as a freshman Member of Congress. Our friendship over the years cut across party lines.

Congressman Joe Martin served in the Congress 42 years and this is a notable achievement of public service. Joe Martin knew and understood the Congress—he knew how to make bipartisanship work. He served his district, the State of Massachusetts, and the Nation as well. He was a genial gentleman. Speaker Martin contributed much to the growth and development of our Nation—and his achievements and accomplishments are a monument to this service.

I should like to extend to the members of his family a most sincere expression of sympathy in their loss and bereavement.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, as truly as it can ever be said of any man, it can be said that our country is a better country because Joe Martin lived in it and gave of himself to its service—that the Congress is a better institution because of Joe Martin's long and devoted participation in it—and that the House of Representatives has been enriched by Joe Martin's presence, as a Member, as a long-time floor leader for his party, and as its Speaker.

The late Representative Joseph W. Martin, Jr.—as his name appears on the official records despite his insistence that his friends, who included almost everyone with whom he ever had personal contact, call him "Joe"—has departed this life, but the mark he has left on his country, our Government, and on his legion of friends, will endure.

The career of Joe Martin was a monument to this country's way of life. A blacksmith's son who had little opportunity for formal schooling, this son of Massachusetts made his way up the ladder of our society, our system of govern-

ment, until he was a nationally recognized power, a man who stood but a heartbeat away from the Presidency itself, a man who held not only the speakership in this House, but who was his party's national chairman and, in many ways, its best-known figure.

But power never changed Joe Martin—the man, the human being. He maintained his official position with the dignity and integrity they required, but never for a moment did prestige and power stand between Joe Martin, the man and his friends, the people.

No man in our Nation's history could have been more fiercely loyal to his party than was Joe Martin, the politician. But there always remained Joe Martin, the man, who never let political beliefs interfere with his friendships. He was a political foe of the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt, but his steadfast personal friend—the same relationship existed between Joe Martin and his Democratic counterpart in this body, the late Speaker Sam Rayburn. I am happy that I knew Joe Martin—and was privileged to have been his friend.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I will always consider myself especially privileged to have begun my service in the House under the leadership of one of the greatest Speakers in history, Joseph W. Martin, Jr.

Speaker Martin was the classic example of the self-made man, and his singular service to his party, the Congress, and the Nation marked him as one of the great men of his time.

His friendship for and assistance to his colleagues in the House were natural and genuine, and gained for him in return the lasting respect and admiration of those with whom he served for so many years.

Speaker Martin was a professional in every sense of the word: As a politician, as a legislator, and as a leader of the House. He was a man of conviction, a man of honor, and a man of the highest moral character.

I join his countless friends and associates in mourning his passing, and will always consider myself fortunate to have known him and to have served in the House with him.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I was personally shaken to learn of the death of Joseph W. Martin, for I had lost an old, lifelong friend.

When I was only 14, I wrote a letter to Joe Martin, who—while he had not yet become Speaker of the House—already had achieved fame as a congressional leader. Being an aspiring Republican, I asked him to what he attributed his success. I was thrilled when he responded with a personal letter citing, among other things, perseverance, to which he encouraged me.

I have cherished that letter to this day, but little did I dream then that I one day would be privileged to serve in the Congress beside this legendary and fabulous personality. It was one of the great experiences of my life to meet him in the House of Representatives and remind him of his words of inspiration many years before to a hopeful youth.

This developed into a close and warm friendship with one of the greatest legis-

lative leaders in our history. His record speaks for itself and for the man; his wisdom, knowledge, and understanding of the legislative process and the two-party system have been matched by only a very few in the history of this House, and indeed, of the Congress.

But above and beyond all else stands Joe Martin's compassionate understanding and his open friendship for us all. The newest Member of this House always received a warm welcome and the unreserved assistance of this man. His cooperation and sympathetic guidance will remain an example in this Chamber for countless years to come.

By his own industry and dedication, Joe Martin became a national institution of political life. The spirit of his works will live with us as long as this mighty Nation stands.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the passing of our dear friend, Joe Martin, touches each and every one of us deeply. Joe Martin was not only a great man but a good man. On one occasion he said to me, and I agreed with him, that he would like to be both great and good but, if he could not be both and he had the power to elect which he would be, he would rather be good than great. But Joe Martin was both.

Joe Martin's cause was America. He symbolized by his words and actions every ideal that our country stands for. During his lifetime he made his contributions to strengthening this great country of ours and passing it on to later generations of Americans with more vitality, preserved and strengthened.

There are so many things that one can say about Joe Martin: his various activities, his nobility of character, his wonderful outlook on life, his dedication to our country, and his love of the national House of Representatives. However, the one thing that impressed me on knowing Joe Martin as I have for so many years was that over and above everything else he was for America and the cause of America and what America stood for. If ever a man evidenced that in the history of our country, Joe Martin did during World War II, during that trying period not only of our Nation's history but the world's history. He and Sam Rayburn, of opposite parties but both Americans, cooperated together with understanding minds that never caused any friction where the national interest of our country was concerned. I remember on one occasion, a very dramatic occasion—and some day it might be placed in history, although I can comment about it now—when Sam Rayburn asked Joe Martin and me to meet him in his office the following morning. When we arrived there there were Secretary Henry Stimson, Gen. George Marshall, and Vennevar Bush. I had heard some rumors about research that was being done somewhere in connection with some weapon of war which later turned out to be the nuclear bomb, but I had no definite information about it until that morning. George Marshall and Henry Stimson told us that we knew that the Hitler government had started ex-

perimenting on this bomb before we did; that there was no knowledge as to the ultimate outcome; how far they had progressed with the project; that we had no knowledge as to how many experimental laboratories the Nazi government had; that it was imperative in the national interest of our country that we develop the bomb first. This was because of the fact that if Hitler did develop it first, overnight, we could lose the war.

Mr. Speaker, all of this relates to what I learned for the first time as the Manhattan project.

Mr. Speaker, Henry Stimson and George Marshall told us it was necessary during the next 2 fiscal years to obtain the sum of about \$2 billion with which to carry forward the Manhattan project, and that they had to get money appropriated in a manner whereby the Nazi government would not know that we were making this experiment or performing this research work, or the fact that the Manhattan project was even in existence.

Mr. Speaker, there was never any hesitance on the part of Joe Martin when the national interest of our country was involved. Henry Stimson and George Marshall said that if the Hitler government perfected this awesome weapon of war before we did, overnight, we could lose the war. We now know after the fact that that statement was not exaggerated. And, from a personal point of view, one of us made the observation that it might represent the sum of \$2 billion being thrown down the cesspool—in other words, we might not be successful. While I made no comment at that time, in my own mind I entertained the thought, "Well, McCORMACK, what are you going to do?" I knew what I was going to do. There was nothing else to do. The national interest of our country was at stake. I said, "Well, McCORMACK, if this is and does ultimately prove to be \$2 billion thrown down the cesspool, you are going to be involved in the greatest financial scandal which this country has ever known, because you are going to be tried after the fact and not before the fact."

Mr. Speaker, the six of us in that room—the Speaker's rooms—like the Rock of Gibraltar, Joe Martin, never had any hesitancy, never had any doubt about the course which we should ask the Congress to undertake. The three of us worked in unity with the others. Later, in strict confidence, we had to give to various Members, particularly members of the Committee on Appropriations, certain information with respect to this project. However, that was one secret that was kept.

Mr. Speaker, I refer to that momentous time in the preservation of our country and its institutions in order to illustrate the character and the dedication of Joe Martin. The test was there. There was never any hesitancy about his response and about his decision.

Oh, Mr. Speaker, we could talk about Joe Martin during the depression, we could talk about Joe Martin during World War II; we could talk about Joe Martin after World War II. But, Mr. Speaker, what a bulwark of strength he was in those momentous and important

days which involved matters of great importance with which the United States of America was faced.

Mr. Speaker, I say this in full view of the fact that the middle aisle made no difference to the late Joe Martin, because in his mind—and I am proud to say in my own mind and also in the mind of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], CARL ALBERT, HALE BOGGS, LES ARENDS and others—the national interest of the United States was foremost.

I came here as a young man. Joe Martin preceded me. He was kind to me, he was considerate and he gave me valuable advice and assistance. A close relationship and friendship developed between us, one that I shall always treasure. The imprint of Joe Martin on the legislative history of America will always occupy the foremost pages in the history of our country.

With the passage of time he became the leader of his party and the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Every day at 12 o'clock when Joe Martin took the Speaker's chair he took it as the Speaker of the National House of Representatives not as the leader of his party—he was the leader of his party—but when he assumed the chair he assumed it as the Speaker, always living up to the highest traditions of this great body. And in the performance of my duty as Speaker both Joe Martin and Sam Rayburn have played a most important part in my life as to the meaning and the significance of the office of Speaker and the great traditions, prerogatives, and responsibilities that are connected with that constitutional office.

Joe Martin could be discussed from the angle of his understanding mind, his relationship to his fellow men, his love of his fellow men and I believe the most effective way to refer to Joe Martin in that respect is that he was truly one of God's noblemen.

I know a little something about the responsibilities of leadership having been in the second position of leadership in my own party for 20 years before being elected Speaker of this great body. Joe Martin faced his duties and responsibilities with judgment, with vision, and with the courage always in that gentlemanly but firm way upholding the traditions and the prerogatives of the House of Representatives.

I hope that if my colleagues say that about me now while I am Speaker or at any other future time I know that I will feel highly honored that they said of JOHN MCCORMACK that he as Speaker maintained and upheld the traditions, the prerogatives, and the dignity of the national House of Representatives.

I am very much touched on this occasion. We are talking not only about a friend but a man who occupied the chair, the office of Speaker of this great body, an unusual honor, and we are talking about a man who upheld that position and performed his duties as a Member of this House in an outstanding manner that justifies him being recorded in the history of tomorrow as one of the greatest and the most effective Speakers of this great body.

So all I can say is "Joe, good day; we are all looking forward to a time in the future of meeting you and renewing our close friendships."

I extend to late Speaker Martin's loved ones the deep sympathy of Mrs. McCormack and myself.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks in the RECORD on the late great Speaker, Joe Martin.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution.

The Clerk read the resolutions as follows:

H. RES. 1087

Resolved, That the House has learned with profound sorrow of the death of the Honorable Joseph W. Martin, Jr., former Member of the House for twenty-one consecutive terms, and Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Eightieth and Eighty-third Congresses.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The resolutions were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the remaining resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

The resolution was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 11, 1968, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RIVERS; Committee on Armed Services. S. 793. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the Alabama Space Science Exhibit Commission (Rept. No. 1161). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JONES of Missouri; Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 657. Concurrent resolution providing for ceremonies in the rotunda of the Capitol in connection with the unveiling of the bust of Constantino Brumidi. (Rept. No. 1162). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALBERT (for himself, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, and Mr. EDMONSON).

H.R. 15822. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to establish the Robert S. Kerr Memorial Arboretum and Nature Center in the Ouachita National Forest in

Oklahoma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 15823. A bill to amend the Military Selective Service Act of 1967 to provide for a fair and random system of selecting persons for induction into military service, to provide for the equal application of deferment policies, to authorize an investigation of the feasibility of establishing a volunteer army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H.R. 15824. A bill to authorize participation by the United States in the construction of a dual-purpose electrical power generation and desalting plant in Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 15825. A bill to rename a lock of the Cross-Florida Barge Canal the "Henry Holland Buckman Lock"; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 15826. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the Federal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DANIELS (for himself, Mr. PERKINS, Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. DENT, Mr. PUCINSKI, Mr. BRADENAS, Mr. O'HARA of Michigan, Mr. CAREY, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mrs. MINK, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. BURTON of California, Mr. AYRES, Mr. QUIE, Mr. REID of New York, Mr. BELL, Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, Mr. ESCH, and Mr. ESHLEMAN):

H.R. 15827. A bill to revise and extend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GURNEY:

H.R. 15828. A bill to strengthen the internal security of the United States; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. HANLEY:

H.R. 15829. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act by increasing the penalties for illegal manufacture and traffic in hallucinogenic drugs (including LSD) and other depressant and stimulant drugs, including possession of such drugs for sale or other disposal to another, and by making it a misdemeanor to possess any such drug for one's own use except when prescribed or furnished by a licensed practitioner, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 15830. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to prescribe penalties for the possession of LSD and other hallucinogenic drugs by unauthorized persons; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.R. 15831. A bill to insure that public buildings financed with Federal funds are so designed and constructed as to be accessible to the physically handicapped; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 15832. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp to honor the barefoot mailmen who carried mail between Miami, Fla., and West Palm Beach, Fla., until 1893; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. UTT (for himself, Mr. HARSHA, Mr. MORTON, and Mr. DEL CLAWSON):

H.R. 15833. A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States with respect to the rate of duty on fireworks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.R. 15834. A bill to amend section 116 of the Housing Act of 1949, to authorize grants for demolition of nonresidential structures that constitute harborage or potential harborage for rats; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H.R. 15835. A bill to amend section 116 of the Housing Act of 1949, to authorize grants for demolition of nonresidential structures that constitute harborage or potential harborage for rats; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RONAN:

H.R. 15836. A bill to amend section 116 of the Housing Act of 1949, to authorize grants for demolition of nonresidential structures that constitute harborage or potential harborage for rats; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SELDEN:

H. J. Res. 1156. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as National School Safety Patrol Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H. Res. 1088. Resolution providing for the printing of the proceedings of the Committee on Agriculture incident to the presentation of a portrait of the Honorable W. R. Poage; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HARRISON (for himself, Mr. STAFFORD, and Mr. POLLOCK):

H. Res. 1089. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the establishment of at least one standard metropolitan statistical area in each

State; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H. Res. 1090. Resolution to authorize the Committees on Banking and Currency and Education and Labor to conduct an investigation and study of the feasibility of establishing an Educational Opportunity Bank; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 15837. A bill for the relief of Domenico and Vincenza Amato and minor children, Giuseppe and Cosimo Amato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15838. A bill for the relief of Francesco Sorce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRASCO:

H.R. 15839. A bill for the relief of Carmelo Pistone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE of Florida:

H.R. 15840. A bill for the relief of Dr. Miguel Angel Ponce De Leon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts:

H.R. 15841. A bill for the relief of Elsa T. Arce and Esther T. Arce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 15842. A bill for the relief of Mr. Jean E. Tsolkas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUPFERMAN:

H.R. 15843. A bill for the relief of the National Board of Young Men's Christian Associations; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 15844. A bill for the relief of Weenice-zia Joan Sharma; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H.R. 15845. A bill for the relief of Helen Rose Botto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 15846. A bill for the relief of Mariano Gerbaudo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida (by request):

H.R. 15847. A bill for the relief of Albert J. Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATKINS:

H.R. 15848. A bill for the relief of Agostino Anania; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Electronic Industries Association Awards Medal of Honor to Edward W. Butler

HON. J. CALEB BOGGS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 7, 1968

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, the electronics industry is important to my State and to the country as a whole; and I was pleased to see that the Electronic Industries Association last night recognized one of the outstanding leaders in the electronics field by awarding him the association's Medal of Honor.

The presentation was made by Robert W. Galvin, Electronic Industries Association president, to Edward W. Butler, chairman of the EIA parts division. Mr. Butler is executive vice president, planning and electronics, Alroco Speer Electronic Components, St. Marys, Pa. Because of the significance of the award and because Mr. Butler has made such an outstanding record as a leader in the electronics industry, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Extensions of Remarks both Mr. Galvin's remarks on presentation of the medal and Mr. Butler's acceptance comments.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Mr. GALVIN. EIA's Medal of Honor was established in 1952 as a recognition of the role of management in advancing the growth of the electronics industry. Tonight we are making our 17th annual presentation to a man who has spent his entire career in our industry and who has, apparently, enjoyed every minute of it.

Edward W. Butler got his first job in what was then known as the radio industry in the same year that the Electronic Industries Association was founded as the Radio Manufacturers Association. That was 1924. He joined E. T. Cunningham, Inc., an early tube manufacturer, as an engineer. Upon the

acquisition of this company by RCA, he served successively as assistant sales manager for tubes, manager of the Radio Division, and finally manager of commercial research for the RCA Victor Division.

In 1944 he joined P. R. Mallory & Co. as manager of the Rectifier Division and three years later became general manager of the Electronics Division of Sylvania Electric Products, Inc. Subsequently he became director of the Radio Division, Federal Telephone, and later managing director of the Canadian Federal Electric Manufacturing Co., an ITT subsidiary, in Montreal.

Upon returning to the United States, he joined the Speer Carbon Co. as vice president, marketing, and recently he was promoted to executive vice president, planning and electronics, as the company name was changed to Alroco Speer Electronic Components.

During these 44 years the radio-electronics industry has grown into a \$23 billion industrial complex and the Radio Manufacturers Association, which began as a small group of radio component manufacturers, has become the Electronic Industries Association and the national organization of electronic system, equipment and component producers. Ed Butler has participated in this growth.

His first EIA activity was in our Tube Division, the next in what was then called the Technical Products Division, now the Industrial Electronics Division. In both he took a leading role as a member of the Executive Committee. As his industrial responsibility has changed, he moved to the Parts Division where since 1960 he has served on our Board of Directors, on the Division Executive Committee, and as chairman of the Parts Division and several committees. He is now nearing the end of his second term as division chairman and is preparing to retire after 44 years in the industry and about half as many years in our Association.

As a leader in the components sector of the electronics industry, Ed has scored a number of successes and, no doubt, a few failures. Yet he has never lost his keen sense of humor, even when things weren't going his way. His friends will probably remember him best as a superb story teller, but everyone with whom he has been associated will recall his constant loyalty and his integrity as he worked persistently for the welfare of EIA and the electronics industry.

I am, therefore, pleased to present this 1968 EIA Medal of Honor to you, Ed, and to wish you many more years of health and happiness in your retirement.

Mr. BUTLER. To receive this medal is an unequalled thrill and I am deeply touched. It's a very heart warming experience just to know that one's peers in the industry feel he deserves such recognition.

I recall the anecdote I told our EIA Board of Directors at the time this award was announced. The story goes that Noah Webster, the father of the dictionary, was quite a man with the ladies as well as an expert in the meaning of words. When Mrs. Webster caught him making love to the parlor maid she exclaimed, "Why Noah, I'm surprised!" "Oh no, my dear," said Webster, "You're astonished, we are surprised."

I have been both delightfully astonished and surprised.

I must tell you that my 44 years in this industry have been rewarding beyond what anyone has a right to hope for.

The growth of the industry in that period exceeds all the Hollywood coined superlatives. Let me give you some examples—in 1924 we had five types of radio receiving tubes; the WD11, WD12, UV199, UV201A and UV200 and a few transmitting and special purposes types.

Since then 2,692 new receiving types have been registered, 3,350 industrial types and, believe it or not, 1,919 types of cathode ray picture tubes.

And in the semiconductor industry which didn't get off the ground until 1948, 5,410 diodes and 5,350 transistors have been registered.

The number of circuits built into electronic equipment in the United States each year has increased from a few million to about 1.5 billion in 1967; by 1970 should reach 2.2 billion, and by 1975, 3.5 billion.

In sales the industry has grown from a few million dollars to over 23 billion dollars in 1967 and now employs a million and a quarter people, 40 per cent in components, 10 per cent in consumer goods, TV, radio, etc., and 50 per cent in industrial and military apparatus manufacture.

All these statistics reflect a dynamic industry in which technical, manufacturing, financial and marketing men have joined to offer great value to the users of their prod-

ucts and services. This dynamism is typified by EIA, which started in the mid-twenties as RMA and evolved into an organization of 300 companies with plants in 40 of the 50 states and representing 80 per cent of the dollars value of sales of the industry.

The courageous and energetic men who have built our industry typify to me all that is inspiring about American management and labor. I treasure the relationship I have had with them.

The last 13 years have been especially gratifying and for this I am deeply grateful to those with whom I have worked; my unequalled boss, my associates in my company, in the industry, in the military departments and the other branches of Government.

To be able to retire from active business with these rewarding experiences fresh in mind is a priceless gift for which I am most thankful.

Mexican Americans' Employment Problems

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1968

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Vicente T. Ximenes, Chairman of the Interagency Committee on Mexican-American Affairs has been mounting a considerable effort to bring attention and improvement to the problems of discrimination against Spanish-surnamed Americans.

Recently, on February 14, 1968, Mr. Ximenes addressed the Interagency Advisory Group of the Civil Service Commission on the difficulties presented for Mexican Americans in getting good Federal jobs. Mr. Ximenes gives an excellent description of the issues involved and offers several constructive corrective proposals.

I commend Mr. Ximenes' remarks to the attention of my colleagues and ask that they be included in the RECORD at this point.

ADDRESS BY VICENTE T. XIMENES, CHAIRMAN, INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE ON MEXICAN AMERICAN AFFAIRS, BEFORE THE INTERAGENCY GROUP OF THE CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION, FEBRUARY 14, 1968

Chairman Macy, Mr. Oganovic, Members of the Interagency Advisory Group, Equal Employment Opportunity Officers, and Coordinators for Federal Women's Programs, I am extremely pleased to join you today.

I wish to recognize, here and now, the personal interest taken by Chairman Macy in the matter of employment opportunities for the minority groups of our nation. I am delighted that he attended the Cabinet Level Hearings in El Paso last October and that he has followed through with meaningful implementation of some of the recommendations made at those hearings.

Not many years ago, no one would have considered a meeting to discuss the employment problems of the Mexican American. As a matter of fact, even the composition of this ethnic group was unclear and some confusion still remains. Perhaps, to start with, we should clear away some debris of terminology. For purposes of our discussion I will use the term "Mexican American" to identify approximately 6 to 6½ million people who are concentrated in five Southwestern states, but who have also migrated into the Northwest, Midwest and even parts of the East. The Mexican American may be descendant of the Spanish explorers Cortez, Cabeza de Baca or Coronado. Or he may have recently immigrated from Mexico and may very well

be a descendant of Montezuma. There are others in the United States who have the same features, background, language, and surnames, but who are not Mexican American. For example, there are Puerto Ricans, Spanish Americans (from Spain), Central Americans (from Costa Rica, Panama, Etc.), and South Americans. There are also Indians in the Southwest who bear similar features, speak Spanish, and have a Spanish surname, but who are not necessarily Mexican Americans. Although all the above groups may rightfully wish to be identified as something other than Mexican American, they have all shared the same problems and experiences as citizens of the United States. My discussion is intended to apply to all Spanish surnamed groups even though I will use the Mexican American handle.

In many respects, the Mexican American experience has not been a happy one. Congressman Henry B. Gonzalez drew on the essence of that experience when he said that "If you are hungry, hope itself is a distant thing; and if you are defeated, promises of better things to come ring empty. If yours is a world of dirt floors and tin roofs, tomorrow holds no promises and your greatest ambition is to live through today."

For too long, America accepted the Mexican Americans as people who lived in "barrios," or the poorest and oldest sections of town, and who held the menial jobs that were available. The first grade teacher knew the Mexican American children as her most annoying charges. They could not follow class instructions given, of course, in English, and they were seemingly the least motivated to learn. They were the youths who came unprepared to speak English and they usually dropped out of school and loitered on the corner for want of something better to do. Not many Mexican Americans made it to high school and fewer still ever took part in a student council election, or were asked to join the national honor societies or were given good citizenship awards at school assemblies.

It seems that very few citizens wondered why almost an entire ethnic group fell steadily behind in the progress of America. If they did question it, they most often concluded that, as a people, the Mexican Americans could simply achieve no more. It rarely occurred to them that they should examine the system for possible causes.

The Federal government was not much more enlightened. Little official notice was taken of the Mexican American community's economic and social patterns as they emerged from the Census statistics. Few Federal officials realized that, in the government itself, programs and institutions were not functioning for the Mexican American as they were for others.

The years passed and changes came about. Our country entered into the Age of Civil Rights—engendered by the despair of the Negro population. Studies were made and comparisons drawn among the minorities. Census figures were examined more closely. Rather indirectly, our government began to realize the conditions of the Mexican American community. It learned that:

Approximately 5 million Mexican Americans reside in the Southwest where only one-sixth of our Country's entire population lives, but where one-fourth of America's poor can be found.

The Mexican American community ranked below any other ethnic group, except the American Indian, in the number of school years completed; over one-fourth had completed less than 5 years of schooling; and, among children of school age, the community had the largest number of dropouts.

Whereas the reported unemployment rate in the United States was between 3.7% and 4%, a Department of Labor 1966 survey of slums in Phoenix, Arizona, and San Antonio, Texas, indicated much higher rates for both areas. In the slum neighborhoods of San

Antonio, where over 114,000 people live, 84% are Mexican American and the unemployment rate is 8%—twice that of the national average. In the Salt River Bed areas of Phoenix, where some 10,000 families reside, the unemployment rate is 13.2%—almost four times the national average.

Measuring unemployment beyond the "traditional" terms, which exclude the special problems of limited employment, low wage employment and completely defeated people who no longer seek jobs, the Department of Labor found that one out of every two residents of the San Antonio slum had a serious employment problem and the same held true for more than four out of every 10 residents of the Phoenix area. Almost three-fourths of these people had not graduated from high school and nearly half had not gone beyond the 8th grade.

The causes, as summarized by the Department, closely coincide with the opinion of the subemployed themselves. The report concludes that the problem is "a matter of personal rather than economic condition. No conceivable increase in the gross national product would stir these backwaters. The problem is less one of inadequate opportunity than of inability, under existing conditions, to use opportunity. Unemployment in these areas is primarily a story of inferior education, no skills, discrimination, unnecessarily rigid hiring practices and hopelessness."

Concerned by these facts which were bolstered by personal knowledge, President Johnson completed the process of involvement for the Federal government. The President determined that our government can and will lead the way toward bringing the Mexican American community into the good life that our country offers. He has brought us to the point at which we now find ourselves.

To accomplish this task will take all our determination. For, if the unemployment rates are alarming, the prospects for the employed Mexican American are not very bright. In a 1966 Equal Employment Opportunity Commission survey of private industry and in the 1966 Civil Service Commission report on minority employment in our government, the Mexican American employees are found to be in the less skilled and lower-paid jobs. Private industry, municipal, state and Federal institution are all guilty on this point. For example—

The Department of Agriculture reported 93,260 world wide identified employees of which 32,979 held GS 9-18 level positions. Of these 32,979, only 140 were Mexican American.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development had 7,475 high level slots, 26 of which were held by Mexican Americans.

The Selective Service had no Mexican Americans in top level assignments.

The Department of Justice had 501 Mexican Americans out of a total force of 30,548. Out of a total of 11,695 positions only 62 were occupied by Mexican Americans.

The 1967 preliminary reports from governmental agencies are somewhat more encouraging, but we have a very long way to go in the area of equal employment for Mexican Americans.

Today, you have asked me to make recommendations as to how we can brighten this picture and remove the obstacles hampering the progress of the Mexican American community. I have, therefore, come prepared with recommendations from the community itself.

First, we must make contact with and appoint more Spanish surnamed Americans to positions of decision, policy-making, implementation and programming in our government. It may well be that the future success of our employment programs and all other governmental efforts that touch on the life of Mexican Americans depends on the personnel making the policy and carrying it through. The most repeated and urgent de-

mand made in El Paso by the participants was for more outreach and better understanding by the government. For this we need the talents of Mexican Americans in high level posts. Further we need the capabilities of Mexican Americans who, if they are not interested in leaving their professions for government service, can be appointed as consultants and advisors for government programs in every field from personnel through community development. Another source of talented manpower is the young Mexican American college graduate. In the past we have neglected to reach out and bring him into government work and, consequently, we have lost out on developing the future expertise that our country needs. It is here, in the professional brackets, that our government can and must exert the highest kind of leadership—make its stand—set an example: for there is no such thing as not being able to find a “qualified” Mexican American. There are most certainly Mexican Americans who *did* manage to acquire an education and very high qualifications.

Our second concern is the up-grading and mobility of Mexican Americans who are already employed by the government. The primary considerations of the community are the need for improved employee-management relations, the need to examine procedures relating to promotions, the need to make our equal employment opportunity programs more effective and the need for extended on-the-job training opportunities.

So often relations between Mexican American employees and their supervisors, who are frequently Anglo, are strained through lack of understanding and communication. I think, at times, we overuse the word “communication”, but there is no real substitute for it in our language just as there is no real substitute for it in our lives. In this case, the Mexican American employee tends to judge the actions of his supervisor by the kind of unfair treatment he and the majority of the Spanish surnamed Americans have received for so long. There are many good reasons for this mistrust. Proposals to train supervisors in equal employment opportunity efforts are excellent and I very much hope they will become a reality. Perhaps the Regional Training Centers for Federal employees which have been established by the Civil Service Commission in 10 major cities would be a good place to begin the process.

The merit promotion system is viewed with the same mistrust by the community and, unfortunately, it has been justified in many cases. I am convinced of this by the daily bulk of mail I receive in my office concerning discrimination in promotions. The suggestion has been made that a re-evaluation be made of the supervisor's appraisal as a ranking factor in promotions and that close examination be given to cases in which minority employees are passed-over for the better positions.

Vice President Humphrey has said that the discrimination problem is not behind us and that this factor “. . . is still the number one stumbling block in our quest for equal employment opportunity—one that shows up in testing and training as much as in recruitment and promotion.” I know that it is still a grave factor in the dead-end jobs held by many Mexican Americans. The experience has been especially bitter at military installations. A case at hand—and one on which I receive much correspondence—is the existing situation at Kelly Air Force Base and other military installations in San Antonio, Texas. These installations are located in an area where almost half the population is Mexican American and where government is the employer of a large number of Mexican Americans. However, this very sizeable group of minority employees hold jobs in the lower grades and are consistently denied promotions on the basis that they are not qualified. Efforts by local Mexican

American organizations to correct the problems have been unsuccessful.

The hearings in El Paso brought forth statements on the ineffectiveness of our equal employment programs. It was suggested that the person responsible for enforcing equal employment opportunity programs should not be appointed by the head of the installation or agency at which he is to serve. Another suggestion was that an outside agency, perhaps the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, should carry out the equal employment objectives of the government.

Discrimination or simply a lack of efforts to communicate have also been factors in the small number of Mexican Americans who participate in on-the-job training to upgrade their employability. It will be necessary to make a conscious effort to let Spanish surnamed employees know that such programs are available. The community is anxious to better itself and to take advantage of training while they work. In the Phoenix and San Antonio slum survey, 80% of the people interviewed said that they would be most willing to take training on the job—if they had jobs and were training offered. I know there are proposals on just this kind of thing, such as Operation MUST, and we must give them priority to get them off the ground.

Our third area of concern is the recruitment and hiring of disadvantaged who have been unable to achieve Civil Service Status and who long ago became discouraged about even applying. Further, we have been weeding out those whose skills and aptitudes do not come through on standard forms of measurement—particularly the Mexican American person who has difficulty with the English language. I am greatly encouraged by the recent attention directed toward the cultural biases and faults of presently used exams, job descriptions, entry-level position requirements and interview procedures.

When we speak of employment opportunities then, these are the major areas of concern for the Mexican American. The community is hopefully awaiting the leadership of the government and, I am certain that we can fulfill that role. To do so, however, means that we make certain our concern makes itself felt in the regional offices and the local offices where the actual work is done. We cannot accept any gestures of compliance as worthwhile unless they render hard and fruitful results.

I would like to leave with you, for your consideration, a few “hard” recommendations:

1. Establish systematic and widespread means of contact with Mexican American organizations for employment referrals and to generally improve communication with the community.
2. Let the Mexican Americans know that top-level positions are not beyond the realm of their capabilities and that you welcome their applications.
3. Make the knowledge of the Spanish language and culture a part of the requirements for positions in areas of concentrated Mexican American population.
4. Conduct sustained efforts to visit colleges with a high Mexican American enrollment and include Mexican American recruiters on your teams.
5. Utilize the Spanish language communications media to advertise job openings.
6. Examine the merit promotion system which has been used to enhance, facilitate and legally justify discriminatory practices.
7. Strengthen the effectiveness and inherent objectivity of the Equal Employment Opportunity officer's position and perhaps require that he report to a board or advisory group of Mexican American citizens as well as to his supervisor and the Civil Service Commission.
8. Utilize the personnel facilities of the Inter-Agency Committee on Mexican American Affairs. We can provide the names of

qualified applicants for many posts to be filled.

Before closing, I wish to re-emphasize that the Inter-Agency Committee will help with any request you may have. Specifically, the Committee is ready to: (1) supply you with a roster of names of individuals who can be called on to act as consultants and advisors; (2) assist you in establishing lines of communication with community leaders and Mexican American organizations; (3) provide the services of staff members to act as advisors; and (4) assist you in your efforts to improve mutual understanding and communication with the Mexican American community through press and radio coverage.

There is in our country a restlessness against the inequity of opportunity. Senator Yarborough pinpointed the feeling when he said that “This restlessness, is afoot today among 5 million Americans whose heritage is grounded in the Spanish language. It is not a violent restlessness but an eager . . . movement. It says . . . Let me be a meaningful citizen. Let me be a real American.”

With concerted effort, we can make this dream a reality.

Thank you.

Navy Enlistment Survey

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 7, 1968

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the March 13, 1968, issue of Navy Times contains an article by Mr. Jim Parker which states that 89 percent give “love of country” as the reason for enlisting in the U.S. Navy.

As Mr. Parker says, this is bound to be a shock to the hippies, peaceniks, and draft card burners. This survey, taken of a sample of 2,340 new recruits, was made in an effort to determine the effectiveness of recruiting programs.

To me, it is most refreshing to find that such a substantial percentage of this sample of the youth of our country does not feel that patriotism and love of country are outmoded ideals.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

EIGHTY-NINE PERCENT GIVE “LOVE OF COUNTRY” AS REASON FOR ENLISTING

(By Jim Parker)

WASHINGTON.—This is bound to come as a shock to the hippies, the peaceniks and the draft-card burners.

It's even somewhat of an eye-opener to those of us who grudgingly admit that kids today are no worse than they were when we were growing up.

The “shocking” fact is that patriotism, or the desire to serve one's country, ranks as one of the most influential reasons why young Americans join the Navy.

Nearly 89 percent of 2,340 brand new sailors, questioned about their motives for going into the service in a recently-completed survey, indicated that love of country had some influence on their decision to enlist. More than one out of every three said that patriotism played a compelling part in making up their minds to join.

Only the desire for technical training and the influence of the time-tested recruiting slogan, “Join the Navy and See the World,”

edged out patriotism as personal reasons for enlisting among those surveyed.

About 94 percent were swayed by the training opportunities and about 91 percent said the chance to travel helped induce them to join.

(No, you don't have 274 percent of 2340 replies; most of the 2340 gave more than one reason.)

Of those surveyed less than 57 percent conceded that draft pressure had anything to do with their decision and less than half of these in turn said that the threat of being drafted strongly influenced their thinking.

Nearly 44 percent said pressure from the draft played no part at all in their decision to enlist.

However, 84 percent replied that their decisions were influenced by their desire to choose the time to fulfill their military obligations—certainly a form of draft pressure—so the overall effect of the Selective Service system on enlistments may be different from that indicated by the answers to the draft pressure question alone.

Other personal reasons cited by the new recruits, in the order of their influence on the decision to join, are:

To gain maturity and self-reliance, 70 percent.

Desire to try military life, 64 percent.

Desire for a Navy career, 60 percent.

Opportunity better in Navy than in civilian life, 51 percent.

Desire to leave home, 25 percent.

Needed a job, 15 percent.

The survey also tried to pinpoint the degree of influence exerted by personal contact with the recruit of his parents, other relatives, friends already in the service and his school counselors.

Nine out of 10 talked the problem over with their parents and nearly as many—88 percent—sought the advice of friends who were in the service. Both groups—parents and friends—were about equally influential in the final decision, with 65 percent of the new recruits conceding that the opinions they received from both these sources was a factor in making up their minds.

The friends have a slight edge over the parents, however, in that 21 percent rated their friends' advice as having a strong influence versus 19 percent who claimed they paid that much attention to Mom and Pop's advice.

Four percent of the parents were against their son's enlistment, while only three percent of his buddies in the service said "stay out."

Brothers, sisters and other relatives were consulted by fewer recruits before they enlisted—76 percent—but this could be a sizable number of those who have relatives to whom they can talk. The survey did not establish what percent had relatives, nor did it establish how many had parents or friends in service.

Two percent of the recruits said their relatives were against their enlisting; 39 percent said they were influenced by their relatives' opinions, and 37 percent said they were not influenced.

School counselors appear to have the least influence of the four classes of personal contacts. More than one-third of the recruits had no contact with their counselors, though 81 percent were high school graduates or had had some college and all but one percent had been to high school.

Five percent said they were strongly influenced to enlist by their counselors; 19 percent conceded some influence, while 40 percent said their counselors had no influence at all on their decision. One percent of the recruits said the counselors were against their enlisting.

The survey also attempted to measure the effectiveness of Navy recruiting programs.

Based on the answers given by the new recruits, it may be that the carefully selected and trained individual recruiter is the Navy's most productive recruiting agent.

His school visits and his letters and postcards to prospects were rated by those voting as the recruiting "tools" packing the greatest wallop.

Actually, recruiting booklets and pamphlets topped both the recruiter's personal appearances and his letters in one respect. The literature was credited by 79 percent as having some influence on their decision, while 77 percent put the visits in this same category and 59 percent cited the correspondence.

But both the visits and the written contacts by the recruiters carried greater impact, outscoring the literature as a "strong influence" thusly: visits, 23 percent; correspondence, 15 percent; pamphlets, 14 percent.

Career counselors' handbooks, recruiting posters, TV "spot" announcements, Navy-sponsored films and radio recruiting announcements were rated effective in that order by the surveyed recruits.

The survey covered 2340 recruits who inked enlistment contracts July 17. Those making the survey recommended repeating the study periodically to obtain up-to-date and comparative information.

They also have suggested a companion survey of cross-sections of high school seniors to probe the thinking of those of them who do not plan to go into the Navy.

Nixon's Pledge

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1968

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an editorial which appeared in the Washington Evening Star on March 7, 1968. The editorial points up, I believe, the improvidence of candidates for high office making rash promises or predictions about the war in Vietnam.

The editorial follows:

NIXON'S PLEDGE

It would be quite unrealistic to suppose that politicians—particularly those who hunger after the presidency—will all be able to toe the high road on the Vietnam war issue throughout this presidential year. Vietnam is, after all, a matter of grave public concern, which makes it a prime candidate for a political football of the year.

But making all the usual allowances for the quadrennial lapses that must be expected of those who reach for the top, the speech by Richard Nixon in Hampton, N.H., was an unusual performance.

In that address, the former Vice President proclaimed his first, major, specific campaign promise, and it was a beaut. His administration would, he said, "end the war and win the peace in the Pacific." He did not say just when or just how this pledge would be redeemed.

Nixon did, however, indicate some things he would not do to end the war. He would not, he assured the audience, pull out of Vietnam. He also ruled out any "push-button way to do this." This, as we translate the phrase, means that he would not resort to strategic nuclear weapons to end the war.

Beyond eliminating these two extremes of action, just what is Nixon suggesting? He repeated his criticism of the administration for not listening to the generals and not escalating the war fast enough. "If it had used at the start the power it is using now, the war would be over," he assured his audience. He also suggested that the nation should "mobilize its economic and

political and diplomatic leadership" as a means of ending the war.

We have serious doubts about the Nixon escalation thesis. The rate of escalation, we believe, was properly set by the amount of power required to prevent a Communist takeover of South Vietnam by subversion or invasion. And as for the second half of the Nixon formula—the call for a mobilization of economic, political and diplomatic leadership—we do not, quite frankly, understand just what he's talking about.

It may be, of course, that Nixon really does have the answer; that, in the fullness of time, he will unveil a practical, quick solution to the Vietnam dilemma that will honor United States commitments and will not invite the devastation of a thermonuclear world war. But pending more evidence than has yet been offered, we are forced to continue in our belief that neither Nixon nor any other candidate has any real alternative to the trying, bloody road now being followed in the search for peace in Asia.

The Realities of Military Preparedness— Address by Senator Thurmond

HON. JOHN G. TOWER

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 7, 1968

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] presented recently at the University of South Carolina a most significant and thoughtful speech on national defense entitled "The Realities of Military Preparedness." Knowing of his particular expertise in this field, I feel certain that all Senators would like to have an opportunity to review his remarks. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the speech be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE REALITIES OF MILITARY PREPAREDNESS

(Address by Senator STROM THURMOND, Republican of South Carolina, to the Student Union, University of South Carolina, Columbia, S.C., February 26, 1968)

Tonight I wish to talk to you primarily about some military facts of life, and outline a few hard decisions which I believe that you, as representatives of young leadership, should consider seriously.

Secondly, I will discuss some of the side effects of America's national defense policies, which in the mid-twentieth century have created significant economic, social and political problems here at home.

In his introduction, Mr. Hines was kind enough to point out my membership on several defense committees and subcommittees in the Senate. In both the House and the Senate, most of the detailed defense work is handled by these committees. After completing their hearings and deliberations on defense budgets and legislation, the committee makes reports and recommendations to the larger legislative body, the Senate.

The responsibility of the Congress in this regard stems from the Constitution, which gives the Legislative Body the power to raise forces for defense, to declare war, to control military appropriations, and to prescribe rules for the government and regulation of the armed forces. This is the civilian control over the military that was so wisely provided by our Founding Fathers. I might add that military officers subscribe to and wholeheartedly support this kind of civilian control.

Perhaps the most important committee that I serve on is the Senate Armed Services Committee. This committee receives much privileged information and cooperation from the Armed Services. Most of its hearings, particularly at this time of year during budget review, are closed to the public because of the nature of information discussed. For example, we met during the past two weeks to hear Secretary McNamara, General Wheeler and the Secretaries and Chiefs of Staff of each of the Armed Services, in turn, present their requirements for next year.

According to last week's *Time* magazine, I am a *Hawk* for having asked the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Earle Wheeler, a hypothetical question about the use of tactical nuclear weapons under certain conditions of warfare. This simple question set off a week of debate in the news media and gave a number of columnists an opportunity to appear knowing and wise. A month earlier, *U.S. News and World Report* called me a "Super Hawk" because of the questions I asked Mr. Clark Clifford when he appeared before the Senate Armed Services Committee for confirmation as the next Secretary of Defense.

Not long ago one of my colleagues in the Senate said that he was not certain whether he was a hawk or a dove, but that he wanted the Record to show that he wasn't chicken. If I were asked, I would think that the few Congressional leaders who stand for maintenance of the strength, security and honor of this country are different from many who are called hawks. These defenders of America would prefer none of the classifications mentioned. Instead I believe that they would like to be classed as Eagles, symbolic of Americanism.

As far as I personally am concerned, I believe, from my past military experience and study of history, that it is essential for a nation to protect itself from the ambitions of covetous rivals. This is particularly true of a nation like the United States that is happily endowed with a great share of the world's blessings. Moreover, history is filled with examples of dictators whose great ambition was to conquer neighboring nations and to extend their borders. The more notable ones were Alexander the Great, Genghis Khan, Napoleon, and Hitler. Today we have the Central Committee of the Communist Party in the Kremlin.

It is to defend against the Soviet threat to our security that I advocate the maintenance of strong armed forces and a progressive research program that keeps this nation ahead in the technology of new weapons. This is one of the most important duties of the Congress and our survival depends on it. Tonight I will discuss some of the important military issues of the times.

USE OF MILITARY FORCE

First, I want to take up a hard decision that our country must face—and face soon. This is the manner in which we use these military forces of ours. Our military strength is no better than its leadership, and it is the leadership of the present Administration that establishes the policies and directs the employment of our Armed Services.

As an approach to this decision, I ask you to consider the problem in the spirit that is so well described in the following prayer:

"O Lord, lest I go my complacent way,
Help me to remember
That somewhere out there a man
Died for me today.

So long as there be a War
I must ask and answer
Am I worth dying for?"

No matter how any of you here tonight feel about the presence of American Forces in Vietnam, I urge that you take a realistic view.

Regardless of previous policies, blunders and mistakes, the War in Vietnam is a fact of life. Most of us have relatives or friends

who are in service, and are therefore personally involved in the war. Many of the effects of this war have been carefully camouflaged until recently. However, the casualties that we have incurred cannot be hidden.

Men are dying for us every day. The number of Americans killed in action tells the story:

In 1964 it was 147; in 1965—1,369; in 1966—5,008; and last year the total was 9,378. During the past three years there have been 100,000 Americans wounded.

This is a terrible toll in personal sacrifice, and our hearts go out in sympathy to the bereaved families. At the same time, our anger mounts over the way in which this war has been conducted—and is being conducted today. Our country is divided over this issue because the leaders responsible have tried to sugar coat the facts, and have carefully spoon-fed the American people with biased reports of progress.

The facts of the case for the American people to consider are these:

Never in the proud history of our country has American prestige been so low.

The management of the war by amateur civilian "experts" has been botched badly.

The fruits of civilian mismanagement of the war in Vietnam are bitter. In addition to the mounting casualty lists, deep schisms at home, loss of face throughout the world, and derision from some former allies for our plight, we must face the fact that the country is not geared to conduct a major war.

The policy of gradual escalation that we have so unwisely followed in Vietnam is like a bottomless pit. It is contrary to good military practice, it is costly and it is indecisive. It gives the initiative to the enemy.

The basic mistake of the conduct of the war was the President's refusal to accept the recommendations of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. These men—the product of years of experience, training and selection—are among the best of the armed forces. The incumbents during the buildup in Vietnam from 1965 to 1967 were: General Earle Wheeler, Chairman; General Harold Johnson, Chief of Staff of the Army; Admiral David McDonald, Chief of Naval Operations; General John McConnell, Chief of Staff of the Air Force; and General Wallace Greene, Commandant of the Marine Corps. The combined experience of these men totals 180 years, 50 of which were in combat. They have spent their lives to learn their military profession, yet in decision after decision on Vietnam they were overruled by the Secretary of Defense and the President. Let me cite a few examples:

The Joint Chiefs of Staff recommended a rapid buildup in 1965 when the decision was made to send American combat units into Vietnam—400,000 men in the first 6 months. They were overruled.

The JCS recommended a paralyzing air campaign at the outset to gain momentum and to keep the advantage. They were overruled.

The JCS recommended the callup of the National Guard and reserves in 1965 in order to win quickly in Vietnam and to keep our guard up elsewhere. They were overruled.

Consequently our military strength around the world has suffered, the war has dragged on, casualties are high, and our men are being killed with weapons supplied by the Soviet Union and Red China.

For three years the military leaders have recommended closing the port of Haiphong, and the other smaller ports of North Vietnam where 85 percent of the modern artillery, tanks, fighter aircraft, radar, missiles, helicopters, and ammunition—almost all of the sinews of war—are imported.

The ports are still open.

The forces in Vietnam led by General William Westmoreland have fought a kind of war never seen before in the history of armed conflict. The military commanders have been subject to the directions of amateur strategists—civilians in the higher levels of the administration with no military

experience and little responsibility. Field commanders have been hampered by nit-picking, detailed orders and constraints. This is not the civilian control envisioned by our forefathers. This is out and out meddling. In this regard, I invite your attention to a report of the Senate Armed Services Committee that was issued in 1962 after the Cuban crisis. I quote:

"If war should come, it can be conducted successfully only by military professionals in that art, and if strategy or tactics come under the direction of unskilled amateurs, sacrifice in blood is inevitable and victory is in doubt."

Let me invite your attention to another report—this one from the Senate Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee. After last summer's hearings on the Air War in Vietnam, the Subcommittee reported, and I quote:

"Every military witness who testified emphasized that the air war had been waged under severe handicaps which were contrary to military principles. Complex and complicated rules and controls, plus the necessity to obtain approval in Washington for even relatively insignificant actions and tactics, have been the order of the day."

The former Deputy Commander of the 7th Air Force in Vietnam, Major General Gilbert L. Meyers, said in connection with these restraints and ground rules: "We were literally fighting with one hand tied behind our back."

As a result of these hearings the situation has improved, but even last week the following restrictions were in effect:

We will not undertake any steps to overthrow the government of North Vietnam.

Our aircraft are not permitted to strike any targets within 5 miles of Hanoi, or 3 miles of Haiphong, without special permission in each case.

Our aircraft cannot cut rail lines in the vicinity of the Red Chinese border, even though it is North Vietnamese territory and not Chinese.

Our aircraft and ships are forbidden to mine the major North Vietnamese ports, including Haiphong, through which most of the enemy supplies are brought in.

Our ships may not bombard any shore installations that are within a line 60 miles south of Hanoi.

Our aircraft may not strike targets in populated areas.

A few weeks ago, the North Vietnamese demonstrated by their attacks on South Vietnamese cities, that they have no compunctions about civilian population, nor do they have any arbitrary sanctuaries.

The inefficiency of long-range, civilian control of Vietnam operations was not limited to the air war. The Gulf of Tonkin incident was another example. During the engagement of August 4, 1964, the Commanding Officer of one of the destroyers fighting off motor torpedo boat attacks was overwhelmed with high priority messages from Washington. Message after message arrived, asking for all kinds of irrelevant details and demanding an immediate answer. It became so bad the skipper's Unit Commander on the scene had to come to his rescue. In a most welcome message of advice he said: "Fight, don't write."

Later, it was said of this engagement: "Never before in military operations have so many directed so few."

I say that it is time to let our military commanders all over the world have the authority to fight (and not write) when the situation calls for it. That policy would have saved the Pueblo.

It is quite popular to call those of us who advocate strong policies, "war mongers." It is not war mongering to insist on the best leadership for the youth of our country who are serving in the armed forces. It is not war mongering to demand tactics that save lives. On the other hand it is a tragic mistake

to get our military men involved in untenable situations where they incur high casualties, and not give them the leadership, tactics or freedom to win.

I ask you, what good does it do to contribute the majority of our national income to the maintenance of forces that we are afraid to use? We are a great, strong nation, whose retribution to insult and aggression should strike fear into the hearts of any aggressor anywhere in the world. Yet we are like a giant with an Achilles heel. The weakness lies in our leadership, which revels in self-pity and glorifies in exhibitions of unnecessary restraint.

These are the men who have made the United States appear ridiculous in the eyes of the world, the men who are unwilling to uphold the honor and dignity of our flag, who participate in No-Win wars, and who permit the capture of a Navy ship on the high seas without immediate retaliation and forceful recovery.

We hear a lot about credibility today. I say that our military strength is not a credible deterrent so long as we are afraid to use it properly. For too many years we have been overly obsessed with fear of world censure, and the reactions of other nations to our initiatives. Because of this fear-oriented philosophy we are bogged down in a war that is draining away our life's blood. In other areas our military resources are stretched thin, and because of our growing reputation for being a paper tiger, these forces are exposed unnecessarily to aggression and insult.

The decision the American people should make, and make this year, requires a reappraisal of our use of force. We should think of the example of Israel—not Egypt. If a war is worth waging, it is worth winning. We should decide, as quickly as possible, if we really plan to win this war in Vietnam—if we do, then we should give our military leaders broad guidance and then let them bring the war to a quick, convincing victory.

If we decide against military victory, there should be no half measure—no more gradual escalation, no more managed news and questionable reports of progress. We've had enough of that. Instead, we ought to adopt the military posture of a declining world power—that is, put our tails between our legs and get running out of Vietnam.

There are three alternatives, then, in this Vietnam affair. First, we can decide that we want to win this war quickly. Secondly, if this administration can't do that, then we can elect an administration that wants to win. The only other alternative is to get out in shame.

With regard to the use of military force elsewhere in the world, we should take back the Pueblo, and demand the return of every prisoner—or else. If our diplomatic demands are not met within a specified time, we should follow with appropriate military action. Otherwise, we must swallow another bitter pill of defeat. Every day that the Pueblo is in the North Korean port of Wonsan is a lasting indictment against the Johnson Administration.

In summary then, I recommend that you and other responsible leaders of society insist that our leadership adopt a realistic policy with regard to the use of military force. I am not advocating that we become an international bully. I am just asking that we remove the chains from the military Sampson that we have built and use military force effectively and efficiently when it is indicated. Further, I am demanding that we take the necessary steps for victory in Vietnam. If the present Administration can't do this, let's elect one that will. The only other alternative is to pull out of Southeast Asia.

THE NUCLEAR BALANCE

Up to now I have been talking about military matters that occur in faraway places.

Let me move on to a subject closer to home—the defense of our country in the nuclear age.

The defense of the United States against nuclear attack is predicated on taking those measures that will best assure that no country will ever unleash the terror of nuclear weapons over this land. In considering this grave question, we cannot afford to make mistakes, or to act on false assumptions. First we have to recognize that the primary opponent is the Soviet Union. We cannot assume, for example, that the Soviets think as we do, or that they will not follow a certain course because it is illogical. For our own safety, security and peace of mind we have to cover all bets—no matter what the cost. We must realize that in this conflict of the minds, we are playing for keeps.

In the past few years we have witnessed a parade of actions that has changed our strategic policy from one of winning to one of deterring. The theory is that the Soviet Union is mellowing, and that the Soviet leaders will see the folly of spending large sums of money to increase their nuclear missile capability, or to bolster their defenses. The policy of deterrence is supposed to reduce international tension and increase stability.

What is the net result of these theories and policies?

In the span of ten years, from 1961 to 1971, the United States and the U.S.S.R. will have reversed their roles as nuclear powers. From a tremendous superiority in delivery capability of nuclear weapons in 1961, the United States slipped almost to parity with the Soviet Union in 1967, and forecasts show a decided Soviet advantage by 1971.

This is calculated in terms of total megatonnage delivery capability—not the number of launchers in place.

The June 1967 report of the House Armed Services Committee, entitled "The Changing Strategic Military Balance U.S.A. vs. U.S.S.R.," shows that the U.S. will have from 8000 to 15,000 total megatonnage delivery capability in 1971. Then, the report states, the Soviets will have from 30,000 to 50,000 megatonnage delivery capability.

I believe that the best way to prevent a nuclear war is to maintain a clear nuclear superiority over all world powers capable of launching a nuclear attack against the United States. For the past two decades we enjoyed a favorable balance of power and were so well-satisfied with our position that we became great philosophers. First we restricted ourselves with the "Second Strike" theory.

This is a serious mistake. Even if we never entertained an intention to conduct a pre-emptive strike, we should keep that information to ourselves. It would be far better in the long run to leave the enemy in doubt. We should make it clear to all nuclear powers that there might be levels of provocation which would cause us to launch a strike against their strategic installations. We could back up that policy with a clear superiority in nuclear strategic forces.

In the 1967 Senate Defense hearings, Air Force Secretary Harold Brown explained the Defense Department's new theory of deterrence. He said: "We have leveled out our missile forces. We announced how big our missile force was going to be. Our plans are that 5 years from now we will have just as many missiles as we have right now. They (the Soviets) have known that. They have known that for a couple of years, and they keep on building. Now we can afford to let them build for a while, if they feel they want to 'catch up.' But there is evidence that if we stop, they don't necessarily stop. They haven't stopped. I think that in our position, we can afford to let this go on for a while, without overresponding."

This was the reasoning and the theory that lost our nuclear superiority.

While we delayed urgent programs recommended by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, we signed the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty in 1963, knowing full well that the Soviets were ahead of us in high yield technology. In upper atmospheric tests the Soviets conducted missile intercepts with nuclear tipped weapons and learned a great deal more than we know about the mysterious "X-Ray" effect and electromagnetic effects of nuclear explosions in the atmosphere. They developed prototypes of space weapons and experimented with the orbital bomb. While we delayed the deployment of our antimissile defenses, they proceeded with theirs.

The second hard decision that I urge, therefore, is the resolution to allocate sufficient funds to maintain a superiority in strategic nuclear attack capability.

HOME DEFENSE

At this time there is some disagreement over the extent and capabilities of the Soviet ABM system, but there is no disagreement over the fact that the Russians have a system that is operational and the United States does not.

The same fallacious reasoning that cost us our nuclear superiority was next applied to the "thin" or "Sentinel" ABM system announced by Secretary McNamara in September 1967.

The Sentinel defense being installed to defend against Chinese ICBM's consists of Spartan and Sprint missile systems, controlled by high resolution radar and computer complexes. Fortunately, the component parts for these systems are in advanced stages of development, and the time interval between the "Go Ahead" and actual installation is much less than it might have been. For this blessing we can thank the Congress and the JCS, who for years have been recommending development of the ABM. Let me give you a brief account of their struggle with Defense:

In the mid 1950's—Each year Congress provided funds for research and development.

In 1963—At the first secret session of the Senate since World War II, Senators were briefed on our strategic posture and were warned that the Soviets had a prototype ABM system. The Senate Armed Services Committee added an amendment to the annual procurement bill, authorizing appropriation of \$196 million to begin procurement of ABM parts. At the instigation of the Administration, this amendment was struck on a roll call vote (58 to 16).

In 1956—At the insistence of the Senate Armed Services Committee, Congress approved 167.9 million for ABM procurement. Secretary McNamara had not asked for these funds and did not use them.

In November, 1966—McNamara finally announced that the Soviets had begun deployment of an ABM system around Moscow.

In January, 1967—President Johnson stated that no deployment of a U.S. ABM system would be made until completion of the arms control negotiations with Russia. Secretary McNamara's military posture report to the Congress contained a lengthy argument against deployment of a complete, Russian oriented ABM system. He stated that it would be a wasteful, ineffective system, and it would disturb the strategic balance. Two days later, General Earle Wheeler, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, disagreed with the Secretary of Defense, and recommended "a measure of defense" for the country.

In 1967—Congress approved the following amounts for the Fiscal Year 1968 military budget:

[In millions]

ABM procurement.....	\$297.6
ABM R. & D.....	421.3
ABM construction.....	64.0

On June 17, 1967—Red China detonated its first hydrogen bomb. Public pressure for immediate installation of ABM defense mounted.

On September 18, 1967—Secretary McNamara announced the decision to deploy a "thin" ABM defense system (the "Sentinel"), oriented against the Communist Chinese threat that would exist by the mid-1970's. He justified this step on the grounds that the Chinese might "miscalculate," but failed to admit that the most dangerous threat to our security would be a similar miscalculation by the Soviet Union.

What we must realize is that the Soviet danger is the major threat, and it must be faced resolutely. The Sentinel system is only the beginning, and merely a step in the right direction. It is time to listen to the recommendations of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the more defense-minded members of Congress. For our future peace and security, our ABM defenses should be expanded. This is the third decision that we should make.

DEFENSE AND SOCIETY

Let me move on now to my last topic, defense and society. For the past two decades, the United States has had to maintain large, standing armed forces. This is one of the most radical changes in the American way of life, and it has been accepted at its face value without sufficient thought. The maintenance of these forces—necessary as they may be—creates economical and political problems not foreseen in the Constitution. It also gives the party in office unprecedented advantages.

Defense dominates the budget, accounting for 57 per cent of the Fiscal Year 1969 expenditures. Defense has become a definite part of our society. It is big; it is everywhere; it is expensive; and it is commanded by the President, the Commander-in-Chief.

The tentacles of Defense reach into almost every part of the country. Each neighborhood has something military: An arsenal; a depot; a shipyard; hospital; air field; training center; fort or recruiting station. Defense contracts and military payrolls are important economic factors in many communities. Defense is big news. Our newspapers, radio and TV programs, bring defense news items into our homes every day.

The Commander-in-Chief of this vast military system wields great power:

He develops and controls the Defense budget.

He can use classified military facts and manage military news to political advantage.

He can order troops to enforce laws (as at Little Rock or Oxford) or he can use troops to suppress civil disorder (as at Detroit or the Pentagon).

He can involve the country in hostilities without consulting Congress (as in Korea or in Vietnam).

We are all familiar with the recent wave of protests against the optimistic reports that came from Saigon in December and January, only to be followed by the violent Viet Cong attacks on over thirty cities in South Vietnam. Let me cite a news story carried in the *New York Times* of January 1, to show you how the Administration tried to manage the news from Vietnam to its own advantage.

The story began, and I quote:

"American officials at almost all levels, both in Saigon and in the provinces, say they are under steadily-increasing pressure from Washington to produce convincing evidence of progress, especially by the South Vietnamese, in the next few months. The pressure began to increase about three months ago, the officials report, and became more intense in December. They expect no lessening, and probably a further increase, as the American elections approach."

In speaking of the so-called "Washington Squeeze Play," one official said that he was told, "An election year is about to begin.

And the people we work for are in the business of reelecting President Johnson in November."

Some of the officials reported that they were afraid to tell Washington the truth for fear of losing their jobs.

Perhaps it was this squeeze play that led President Johnson to say in his State of the Union message last month that, "The number of South Vietnamese living in areas under government protection tonight has grown by more than a million since January of last year."

Today, thousands of dead civilians, casualties of the Viet Cong Tet attacks on cities of South Vietnam, are mute evidence of the fallacy of that statement.

This example, I submit, is just one of the power plays that we will witness during this election year. To me, it is not only poor taste, but downright dangerous, for the Administration to use trumped up news of the war for perpetuation in office. I ask that you be alert to managed news, or even managed crises, by the Administration as November draws near.

George C. Wallace

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1968

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the show of panic and fear from the old line politicians and special interest groups over the presidential candidacy of former Gov. George C. Wallace of Alabama, continues to be classic.

While most other politicians chase vote blocs and deal for big name support, Mr. Wallace, an elected State judge before being Governor, talks to the American people offering solutions to their problems and the plight of our country.

Perhaps the small minorities who seek ways to lock up the machinery of both parties for a controlled election do not realize the foolishness of their worrying about which party, that is Democrat or Republican, George Wallace will hurt the most.

What their spokesmen are broadcasting to the people is that there is one party George Wallace will not hurt—the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I include the front-page story from the March 5 *Christian Science Monitor* following my remarks:

[From the *Christian Science Monitor*, Mar. 5, 1968]

GOP HURT IN 28 STATES—WALLACE INROAD WIDENS

(By Godfrey Sperling, Jr.)

WASHINGTON.—The threat that George C. Wallace poses to the Republican Party in this presidential year is growing rapidly.

A new state-by-state assessment by The *Christian Science Monitor* shows the Wallace candidacy damaging the GOP in 28 states with 268 electoral votes.

In September a similar appraisal showed the former Alabama governor damaging the Republican presidential candidate in 14 states with 17 electoral votes.

At the same time he will cut into the Democrats in five states (as against seven in the September survey) and will hurt both parties in seven states (eight in September).

From this evidence it seems that Mr. Wallace has already moved far toward reelecting President Johnson—or toward throwing

the contest into the House of Representatives.

The big imponderable remains—the identity of the Republican presidential candidate.

However, this survey, in the main, reflects the growing activity and strength of Mr. Wallace around the United States, irrespective of who the Republican candidate might be.

BALLOT POSITION POSSIBLE

The *Monitor* survey, by writers in the 50 states, also shows that:

Mr. Wallace should be able to get on the ballot in at least 35 states. In Alabama he will be running as a regular Democrat, and he may be able to do so in Louisiana. In most instances he will be on the ballot as the nominee of the American Independent Party. He already is on the ballot in California.

Wholly apart from his ability to damage the two main presidential candidates in November, which appears to be considerable, is the extent of his own organization and the amount of support he will be getting.

The assessment shows the fiery segregationist has little significant support—organized or financial—in 36 states. Thus, the Wallace role will be that of a "spoiler." This role is becoming solidified. But he is far from becoming a serious contender to gaining the presidency for himself.

Mr. Wallace has appeared in 21 states, with favorable reaction in about half of them: Illinois, Missouri, Virginia, Kansas, and Nevada, among others.

On a nationwide basis, he will have "random" and "scattered" appeal to dissident voters. He will have a substantial attraction for such voters in Louisiana, Maryland, and Georgia. The definition of "dissident" varies considerably from state to state. A sampling: California—Republican conservatives and "Bible Belt Democrats who migrated here from the South."

Illinois—Factory workers from the South. Minnesota—Birchers and "ultra Republicans"; blue-collar workers, cab drivers, small merchants.

Pennsylvania—"Goldwater Republicans and big-city and urban Democrats who dislike the administration's drive for equal rights in jobs and housing."

Mr. Wallace has "sizable" to "strong" support in eight states, five of them Southern: Alabama, Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Indiana, California, Ohio, and Virginia. In Louisiana this is due to "the chief Wallace booster, arch-segregationist Leander Perez, political boss of wealthy Plaquemines Parish and long a formidable figure in state politics.

Mississippi—"Since maverick Democrat John Bell Williams won the governor's race, much high-level political strength can be expected for Mr. Wallace."

FINANCING IMPORTED

California—"Much of the organized support—and money—comes from out of state. Mr. Wallace peppered California with Alabama officials, who oversaw his registration drive. Much of the money was brought from Alabama, too."

"In Ohio, Wallace could expect financial support were he on the ballot. But legal restrictions will keep him from mounting his third party here."

In five more Southern and border states—Florida, Georgia, Maryland, South Carolina, and Tennessee, he has significant grassroots support though without organized and/or financial backing.

Florida—"I would say significant support, although not particularly well-organized... I would doubt a significant amount of financial support..."

Maryland—"He will attract lots of support from the little guy, the forgotten man... financial support would be vast if the outlook for Mr. Wallace improves measurably, e.g., that the election might be thrown into the House of Representatives."

The Alabamian's most telling issue is race—and variations on the themes—"crime in the streets," "law and order." Even his "antiwelfare, anti-Great Society giveaways" attitude is seen as a race variant.

Kentucky—"As I see it, he has only one string to his bow—race. He will hit crime in the street hard, and win some votes with it, but that is race, too. Law and order is the same thing."

Ohio—"If he ran in Ohio, the issue would be racism—regardless of how he coded it; 'crime in the streets,' 'welfare,' etc."

Next to race Mr. Wallace's big issue is states' rights, then "hawkism." Other issues receiving scattered mention: anticommunism, antintellectualism, ineffective foreign aid. He is also seen as having an appeal for the "average guy" and as providing an answer for some in the "general atmosphere of unease."

In 33 states he stands to pick up few votes from disenchanted Democrats. In eight of these states—Colorado, Connecticut, Idaho, Maine, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New York, and South Dakota—the disenchanted are inclining toward Minnesota's Sen. Eugene J. McCarthy.

GOP DRAWS DISENCHANTED

In six states—Arizona, Florida, Illinois, Rhode Island, Washington, and West Virginia—the disenchanted identify more with the GOP, in Rhode Island, Washington, and West Virginia, they would be especially inclined to do so if the GOP candidate is New York Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller.

Some disenchanted should go over to the Wallace side in Indiana, Louisiana, New Jersey, and Tennessee. Substantial numbers of disenchanted will rally to him in Alabama, Georgia, Mississippi, and South Carolina.

Writers in three states didn't note the element of the disenchanted-Democratic vote.

Mr. Wallace can count on considerable backlash sentiment in 12 states: Alabama, California, Delaware, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Louisiana, Mississippi, Maryland, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Virginia. Seven of these states are Southern.

In 10 states there is "some" backlash: Florida, Kentucky, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Tennessee, and Wisconsin. Four of these states—Kentucky, Minnesota, Tennessee, and Wisconsin—note specifically that summer riots could generate more backlash.

In 28 states, 15 of them Western, any backlash sentiment is minimal although, again, summer riots could in some instances heat it up.

The most frequent reaction of party leaders to Mr. Wallace's announced candidacy was "indifference" although both "consternation" and "delight" were also reported. This is closely linked with leaders' assessment of which party Mr. Wallace stands to hurt most.

The Alabamian will have trouble—ranging from "some" to "considerable"—in getting on the ballot in some 15 states: Arizona, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Kentucky, Massachusetts, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New York, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Texas, Wyoming, and West Virginia.

In Ohio, Mr. Wallace's prospects of running as a third-party nominee are virtually nonexistent: "Creation of a third party in Ohio requires the petition signatures of 433,100 persons—a sum equal to 15 percent of the total vote cast for governor in the preceding election." The reporter noted: "Ironically, Mr. Wallace probably would poll about 15 percent of Ohio's presidential vote if he were on the ballot."

A report coming out of the Wallace camp indicated that he would not try to get on the ballot in Ohio and Idaho.

The Wallace impact as seen in his home territory.

He will sweep Alabama and Mississippi (17 electoral votes together) and may take Louisiana (10 electoral votes).

In Louisiana, Florida, Georgia, South Carolina, Virginia, Tennessee—with 67 electoral votes—the Wallace candidacy could result in giving the states to President Johnson which, in a straight two-party race, he wouldn't be able to win.

In Louisiana this would be assured if the Republicans run Richard M. Nixon or California Gov. Ronald Reagan. The conservative vote will be split and the state will go to Mr. Johnson. If, however, the GOP nominee is Governor Rockefeller, Mr. Wallace will pull all the conservative votes and take the state.

Georgia—"Mr. Wallace will hurt the GOP presidential candidate, help the Democrat. Without him, the state would be Mr. Nixon's; with him, it likely will be LBJ's."

South Carolina—"Observers feel that the dig into the Republican vote—depending upon a good many factors that could develop between now and the election—could make President Johnson the top man on the totem pole, whereas it is very doubtful that he could carry the state in a straight two-party race."

SIDE-EFFECT NOTED

Tennessee: "One . . . Democrat said he felt so strongly the only way Mr. Johnson could carry Tennessee again was for Mr. Wallace to be on the ballot. 'I've already sent the Wallace campaign one donation and I'm going to send another soon because I don't want him to get discouraged,' this Democrat said."

Mr. Wallace will run behind in Arkansas and North Carolina, regardless of who the GOP nominee may be. But he will do better in Arkansas than was thought possible in September. "In early January, Jim Johnson, the former Arkansas Supreme Court justice who is about the last of Arkansas's unreconstructed reactionaries still making headlines (Winthrop Rockefeller defeated him for governor by only 40,000 votes in 1966) announced that he would be the campaign manager for Mr. Wallace in Arkansas."

In three border states—Kentucky, Maryland, West Virginia—Mr. Wallace stands to hurt President Johnson, and this will be especially true, say Kentucky and Maryland, if the GOP candidate is Mr. Rockefeller.

Mr. Wallace appears to have destroyed the GOP chance of winning the South with a conservative nominee like Mr. Nixon or Governor Reagan, although one Southern reporter indicates that "Mr. Nixon may well hold votes from Mr. Wallace that Governor Rockefeller would lose."

Inaugural Address by Dr. Lincoln Gordon, President, the Johns Hopkins University

HON. JOSEPH D. TYDINGS

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 7, 1968

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, Maryland is extremely fortunate to have located within it one of the outstanding private universities of the world—the Johns Hopkins University, at Baltimore. We are doubly fortunate in also having as the president of this university one of the America's most distinguished educational and diplomatic leaders.

I refer, of course, to Dr. Lincoln Gordon, and I describe him as an educator and diplomat of "the Americas" because of his service, by appointment of President John F. Kennedy, as Ambassador to Brazil.

A few days ago, on February 22, 1968, the official installation of Dr. Gordon as president of the Johns Hopkins University was held. On that occasion, Dr. Gordon delivered an address of impor-

tance concerning the future of academic leadership in the world.

In particular, I was pleased to see his description of the growing interdependence of the nations of the world and the special challenge this interdependence offers to the universities.

Dr. Gordon also called for the establishment in Washington, D.C., of greater facilities for university-based graduate training and research related to domestic and international concerns. Such an effort to take advantage of the unique opportunities for interchange with the makers of policy in our National Government and the international institutions located in Washington could help to train the administrative leaders of the future. Knowing Dr. Gordon, I am sure that we can expect the Johns Hopkins University to assume early leadership in this connection.

May I also call to the attention of Marylanders—and to all who are interested in the maintenance of the highest quality of graduate and professional education—Dr. Gordon's analysis of the financial crisis now faced by the Nation's great private universities. He points out, for example, that a recent study of the Universities of Chicago, Princeton, and Vanderbilt indicate that by 1976 "the sum of tuition revenues, endowment income, and private gifts as reasonably projected from current trends will fail to cover something between 28 and 39 percent of essential educational and general university expenditures." Dr. Gordon's discussion of the desirable actions which can be taken to meet this financial crisis of the private universities is well worth study.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Gordon's inaugural address be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

INAUGURAL ADDRESS, FEBRUARY 22, 1968

Mr. Charles Garland, distinguished chairman of the board of trustees; Your Eminence, Cardinal Shehan; Your Excellencies, Ambassadors of great and friendly neighbor nations; Your Honor, Thomas D'Alesandro III, mayor of Baltimore; Mr. C. Stanley Blair, secretary of State of Maryland, representing His Excellency, Governor Agnew; President Pusey, President Smith, and other presidents of universities of the United States and of the institutions of higher learning of the State of Maryland; President-Emeritus Milton Eisenhower; my colleagues, members of the faculties of the Johns Hopkins University; fellow trustees, alumni, students, and friends of the Johns Hopkins community; it is a moving experience to receive the mantle first assumed by Daniel Colt Gilman ninety-two years ago today, passed through so distinguished a line of successors, and worn with such grace and devotion for the past eleven years by Milton Eisenhower. And it stirs the imagination to realize that this institution—the first true university in the United States—is within a decade of entering its second century and must perforce inquire where it has come and whither it would go.

When he accepted this torch from the still vigorous hands of Daniel Gilman on Washington's Birthday in 1902, our second President, Ira Remsen, made two singularly felicitous observations. He recounted the maxim that "old men tell of what they have seen and heard, children of what they are doing, and fools of what they are going to do." But he also said that "The Johns Hopkins Uni-

versity cannot live on its past, however praiseworthy that past may have been. If the contemplation of the past has the effect of stimulating us to our best efforts, it is a profitable occupation. If it lulls us into inactivity, it is fatal."

On that same occasion, President Gilman himself had reviewed a quarter century of development of American higher education, led by the Hopkins, and compared it with the beginnings of modern universities in thirteenth century Bologna, Paris, and Oxford. A lesser man than Gilman might have vaingloried in his record of momentous innovation—of what he called "those early days of unbounded enthusiasm and unfettered idealism."

First in graduate training and systematic research; first to raise to a new plane American scholarship in all branches—humanities, natural science, and social science; first in modern medical education; first in the university publication of learned journals and scholarly works;—Gilman's Hopkins had been paid the ultimate compliment of imitation and adaptation by her ancient sister institutions, notably including Harvard, by the progressive new State universities of the middle and far west, and by the even younger and bountifully endowed private universities of Chicago and Stanford.

But Gilman had also become painfully familiar with the consequences of limited financial means: the sale of Johns Hopkins' estate at Clifton; the long delays in establishing the School of Medicine; and the abandonment of plans for a School of Law. He knew that Hopkins was no longer in a class by itself. There was intense competition for able recruits to the faculty and he even saw some "danger of rivalry in the solicitation of students" through graduate fellowships. As long ago as 1902, he expressed concern at what today we call the "information deluge." And his eye remained fixed on the future, on what might be done in the next twenty-five years with the new start made possible by the gift of the Homewood campus.

It is in a like spirit of proud respect for our admirable past, of candid appraisal of our present strengths and weaknesses, and of confident probing into the challenges and opportunities of the future that we inheritors must explore the new directions for Johns Hopkins as we approach our centennial.

This exploration takes place in an environment of ferment and self-questioning in American higher education unrivaled since the days of our origins. The change in scale alone would be enough to generate such ferment. When Gilman took office, there were in the nation some 90,000 students beyond high school, or 2 per thousand of population. By the eve of World War II, this ratio had risen to 10 per thousand, but today it stands at over 30 and in a few years will pass 40, with a total student population of more than 9 millions.

So drastic a change of scale not only creates obvious problems of organization, staffing, building, and resources; it alters the nature and purposes of higher education and reflects deep changes in the structure and aspirations of the entire national community. At the same time, the status of the university in the public mind has become transformed, notably in the decade since the first Sputnik. The intellectual is no longer disdained as an unworldly dreamer. Nor does he suffer poverty as an earnest of his devotion to learning. Research has become a major national occupation, with basic research concentrated largely in the universities. Our institutions and their faculties are looked to for applied research and policy recommendations on every problem of public concern. Often the expectations of society are unduly high. The universities are under constant tension between their primordial

functions of teaching and research and the new demands upon them for service to society.

It is no wonder, then, that the world of higher education is engaged in soul-searching debate on its structure and its mission. With massive student numbers the order of the day, what devices of decentralization can be found to treat the student as an individual human being? As the volume of knowledge expands in exponential function, are we to produce super-specialists or whole men? Can we continue to prolong the curriculum until our graduates are in their thirties before they enter upon independent careers? Will graduate training be divided into two tracks: the Ph.D. for the mass of liberal arts and community college teachers and a post-doctoral course for university teachers and professional researchers? Are we seeking to produce a technocratic elite—a race of uncommon men apart—or a leadership integrated into the whole of society? Should our separate efforts somehow be guided or coordinated into a relationship with national needs for various categories of specialized manpower? How does our work relate to the hopes and fears of a nation and a world in uneasy tension and flux?

These are not questions to be resolved solely within the universities, but they do converge on us. As all of us look to the future, we shall be making our contribution to the answers, consciously or unconsciously.

Where does Johns Hopkins stand in this fluid scene of American higher education? We think of ourselves as a small university. Among the forty-two United States institutions in the Association of American Universities, we rank fortieth in full-time student numbers, although twenty-first in annual operating expenditures and thirty-fourth in size of faculty. But we too have grown in substantial measure during the first two thirds of this century.

When Gilman laid down the reins in 1902, Hopkins had 172 graduate students in arts and sciences and 164 undergraduates. Today there are 1366 and 1813, respectively, a 9½ fold increase. The corresponding faculty numbers rose from 51 to 271. In Medicine, the student numbers have increased only from 229 to 419, but the full-time faculty from 42 to 409. In addition, the School of Hygiene and Public Health and the School of Advanced International Studies (including its branch in Bologna) each counts almost 300 students. Our Evening College now serves more than 7,000 students, three-fifths of whom are candidates for degrees. Several hundred post-doctoral fellows are in residence. Our Library collections have increased from 100,000 to 1,600,000 volumes. Annual operating and research expenditures were \$277,000 in 1903; today, exclusive of the Applied Physics Laboratory, they amount to some \$60 million. Operating expenses per full-time student, not including sponsored research, have risen from \$490 to \$6,700, more than three-fold in real value after adjusting for the lowered purchasing power of the dollar. In Medicine, the expenditure per student in 1903 was \$362, equivalent to \$1,600 at present price levels; today the corresponding figure, still excluding sponsored research, has soared to \$21,200. Since Gilman's day, the university has also made capital expenditures in a cumulative total of some \$110 million.

No wonder that new means of financing have been required. Of Remsen's first budget, 56 percent came from endowment income and 32 percent from tuition and fees. Dr. Eisenhower's last budget received only 8 percent from endowment income, 15 percent from tuition and fees, and no less than 52 percent from Federal Government sources. Private current gifts, a mere \$1,000 in 1903, have happily risen—with growing and most welcome help from our alumni, as well as foundations and friends—to almost \$11 million in 1967.

In this record of material growth; in the raising of faculty salaries to restore us to a fair competitive position in the top grouping of American universities; and in the launching of new academic initiatives of high promise, the past eleven years stand out as a period of great vitality in the history of Hopkins, comparable only with the early beginnings. Our collective debt to the administration of my distinguished predecessor has been well recorded in the special report by the Chairman of our Board published by the Johns Hopkins Magazine last May. With characteristic modesty, Charles Garland said nothing in that report about his own substantial role in those accomplishments. I have come to harbor the hope and expectation, which I am certain will meet the favor of my fellow Trustees, that in due course the name of Garland will be permanently memorialized on this campus just as our great new research library so aptly commemorates the name of Milton Eisenhower.

How, then, should we look to the future? We can no longer pioneer in the heroic manner of Gilman's great first quarter century, because we are no longer alone. We are only a single partner—and a small partner—in the vast enterprise of the contemporary American university. But we can and must maintain a place in the front rank of that enterprise and we must search out those attributes and opportunities where we enjoy comparative advantage. Our history and traditions endow us with some of those attributes and opportunities. The flexibility of limited size and private governance give us others. Our unique position as a leading university close to the national capital, with one strong asset firmly planted within it, is another asset whose potential should be fully explored. The rest depends, in the words of the bard, not on our stars, but on ourselves.

Long-range planning is a singularly difficult endeavor. The methodological perplexities of forty brilliant men, brought together by the American Academy of Arts and Sciences as the Commission on the year 2000, are eloquent testimony to the difficulties. Long-range planning seeks to evaluate trends which already foreordain their consequences; to appraise pressures in the environment to which some response is inescapable; and to weigh and choose among alternative aspirations in the knowledge that material and human resources are never unlimited. It is in no sense mere forecasting. We should be deluding ourselves, if not others, if we sought to draw rigid blueprints for what must be a process of organic growth.

Nevertheless, we must make the effort to plan, since some of our day-to-day decisions commit our heirs for decades, and many cannot be made wisely without some realistic image of what our institution may comprise in five, ten, or fifteen years. Looking at the Hopkins within a radically shifting framework of American higher education as a whole, we must ask ourselves, perhaps with our Centennial year as a convenient target date, what scale we should aim for; what proportion of undergraduates, graduate students, and post-doctoral fellows; what size and distribution of faculty numbers; what resultant needs for classrooms, offices, laboratories, libraries, computer facilities, living and social accommodations; how research should relate to teaching; what size and character of medical training; what interconnections to build among our several divisions; which growing points should be stimulated and which points of decay discarded; what fields of research and of service to emphasize; what relationships we should develop with sister institutions, with our surrounding metropolitan community, and with governmental agencies; and last, but not least, what are the financial implications of the various sets of alternatives.

This is no task for a president or university administration alone. It requires a

major contribution from the faculties. It needs active participation by junior as well as senior faculty, and inputs from student representatives, from trustees, and from all the other elements which constitute our interested publics. A major beginning was made in the Long-Range Planning Report of a strong committee led by Professor William McElroy in June of 1966. Pursuant to its recommendations, planning has now become a continuing process guided by our Provost, Dr. William Bevan. It is, as it should be, a highly decentralized process, building up from individual departments and divisions at the same time that broader factors are discussed in a central group. Nor do we deceive ourselves that the facts in 1976 will accord in detail with any pattern that we can foresee in 1968. Like other organic growths, universities respond to the changing opportunities in their environment as well as following their genetic endowment.

Without seeking in any way to preempt or prejudge a collective planning process still in its infancy, let me take the occasion to indicate some directions and constraints that appear especially important. Members of the faculty may forgive this boldness on my part, since two departments have been so gracious as to admit me to their fellowship.

It is a commonplace to say that no single university can deal with all aspects of human knowledge. Our small size has always made this clear for Johns Hopkins. Today, however, consciousness of the "information deluge," so well documented in our Magazine last fall, makes it true even for a giant like the University of California. How, then, are we to select our priorities and to modify them as the structure of knowledge itself changes? The old method was to recruit one or two outstanding minds in each of the recognized disciplines and to give them their heads. That method produced brilliant results. But today we face the paradox that research not only threatens to overwhelm us with the sheer quantity of its findings, but also leads to a proliferation of disciplinary branches. At the same time, many of the most significant areas of basic exploration are at the common boundaries of established disciplines, and many fields of research require a multi-disciplinary attack. The interlocking of physics, chemistry, biology, and engineering science in recent years is one obvious example of the former tendency; the development of biomedical engineering exemplifies the latter.

Two conclusions appear to follow. One is that each faculty group, in "thinking the future," must seek to identify the more significant growing points and research challenges and guide its recruitment of new colleagues accordingly. The other is that much of this thinking must be done in groups which cross traditional departmental and divisional lines, with a corresponding readiness to alter the institutional structure by consolidation and deletion as well as by addition.

This process cannot be limited to obviously allied disciplines, such as the terrestrial and environmental sciences where departmental consolidations are now being made. The recent biological discoveries in genetics will lead to a new science of human development, in which neurology, psychology, and social studies will all become involved. Linguistics; the nature of learning; the new anthropology; oceanography; the ecological approach which relates individual and social evolution of various forms of life to all aspects of the environment: these are only dramatic examples of the reintegration of knowledge which is the counterpoint to great specialization.

Nor does this continuum of understanding and exploration stop short of the humanities. On the contrary, the scientific and technological explosion has given new urgency to the study of man's creative capacities, to philosophy in its moral as well as

its logical branches, to the meaning of good and evil, to a sense of dignity and of indignation at injustice, to artistic sensibility and the divine spark which differentiates civilization from ant-hills. Vannevar Bush, a great natural scientist and one of our Trustees-Emeritus, has recently summarized his mature reflections under the title *Science Is Not Enough*. "On the most vital questions," he says, "it does not even produce evidence." And Archibald MacLeish, a great humanist, reminds us that "the man who knows with his mind only, has no freedom anywhere. Sooner or later his life will seem indifferent to him." History has not ceased to be our master teacher; in the phrase of Dionysius, it is "philosophy teaching by examples."

The Planning Committee of 1966 made a compelling case for the enlargement of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, notably in social science and humanities departments where the present scale is inadequate for broad general coverage along with such specialties as we may choose for particular emphasis. That enlargement is well begun, but it must be pressed forward with energy as an urgent claim on additional resources we may be able to muster. Mathematics, statistics, and computer science are also evident candidates for major growth, as disciplines in themselves and in interface with a wide variety of other areas. New horizons constantly unfold in medicine and public health. Cooperation between the academic divisions and the Applied Physics Laboratory has already produced fruitful innovations in biomedical engineering, and we can foresee its expansion into such fields as radiochemistry and astrophysics. Among disciplines in which we are now wholly lacking, strong claims can be made for Slavic and Oriental Studies as indispensable in today's world, even in a small university. Administrative studies may well become a new interdisciplinary focus for the social and engineering sciences, perhaps related to new endeavors in professional preparation for careers in education, government, or business.

One of the glories of the Hopkins is precisely the capacity to develop fruitful intercourse among disciplines. It behooves us to encourage this capacity on a university-wide basis. We have done much to overcome the spatial obstacles which separate Homewood from the Medical campus, Medicine from the Applied Physics Laboratory near Columbia, Homewood and Public Health from the International School in Washington. In the coming decade, we must do far more on these lines.

The American university is no intellectual ivory tower, pursuing the world of mind and spirit apart from the society in which it is imbedded. A romantic dream imagines that it was once so, and might be recreated in that image. Like Rousseau's dream of the noble savage, the image has no counterpart in true history, least of all at Johns Hopkins. Gilman pointed in 1902 to our record of service in many fields to the national and local communities. The basic concept of medical school joined to teaching hospital entailed a combination of service with education. The School of Hygiene and Public Health was service-oriented from its foundation in 1916; it has always engaged in applied research in many parts of the world alongside its basic educational mission.

Experience suggests that research in areas of broad social concern is one of the most fruitful ways of achieving a productive synthesis of related academic disciplines. The annals are full of purely academic interdisciplinary experiments leading only to a kind of cross-sterilization. The prospects of promotion and placement for younger faculty members constantly pull them back to their parent disciplines. In contrast, the war time programs of defense research demonstrated the power of combined assaults on urgent security problems, and similar ef-

forts have been organized since the war in many areas outside of national defense.

The proper role of the university in this field is under intensive debate. There are legitimate fears that ill-considered acceptance of public service responsibilities may undermine the basic mission of the pursuit of learning. On the other hand, especially in the social sciences, where society itself is the laboratory and where basic and applied research are scarcely distinguishable, engagement on significant problems of the real world offers unique opportunities for advancing knowledge and infusing teaching with meaningful content.

A recent report of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching suggests the precept that universities "participate, if possible, only in public service activities that are a direct outgrowth of their regular teaching and research programs and that, in turn, feed back into and strengthen them." This guidance is sound enough, but perhaps somewhat simplistic, since the range of teaching and research programs is not static. I would add two more precepts: that the university should not become an agency for governmental operating functions, and that its organized work should conform to the long time perspectives for which its talents are peculiarly suited.

For Johns Hopkins, bearing in mind our present strengths and our location in Baltimore and Washington, I see four broad areas for expansion of our efforts in direct relation to problems of public policy.

First, as a great university medical center, including a renowned hospital and a strong School of Hygiene and Public Health and bolstered by specialists from various arts and science departments, located within easy reach of the relevant federal agencies, we have a unique opportunity to contribute to the reshaping of systems of health care and development of the basic and allied health professions in all their aspects—scientific, professional, manpower, administrative, and financial. This does not mean that we must ourselves undertake all of these functions, but the Hopkins community should be better situated than any other to devise working patterns to meet national and international health needs.

Secondly, the time is ripe for a better organized focus for our many present activities related to urban problems, notably in Baltimore but also more widely. The three faculties concerned—Arts and Sciences, Medicine, and Public Health—have recently endorsed the establishment of a University Center of Urban Studies, and we are now developing detailed plans to this end. It will perform three broad functions: to facilitate the work of fourteen departments already sharing a common interest in this field; to develop new programs of research susceptible of fruitful multidisciplinary exploration; and to focus the university's cooperation in urban matters with local, state, and national governments, with other educational institutions, and with other groups concerned.

In the international field, thirdly, there is a long history of activity by all of our present academic divisions, one of which—the School of Advanced International Studies—is entirely devoted to training and research in international affairs. One strain of contemporary thought, in reflex against our overseas military involvements, urges a kind of national withdrawal from the world. It argues that engagement is inherently imperialistic, and that our international position would be best served by creating an enviable model of domestic society. Nothing, in my view, could be more shortsighted. One day, somehow, Vietnam will again be at peace, but the great problems of world order, of potential mass destruction, and of unruly nationalism will persist. The pressures of population, the demand for food, the instinctive rebellion against a widening

gap between rich continents and poor, and the cultural interpenetration fostered by instant communication and near-instant transportation all point toward greater international interdependence for good or for evil. Moreover, this interdependence involves an increasing interaction among events within nations traditionally considered of purely domestic concern.

Here is a special challenge to the universities, with their ancient tradition of the international fellowship of scholars and their capacity to look beyond the dilemmas of day-to-day foreign policy which necessarily preempt the attention of governments. There are many possible patterns for university action: area study centers; alliances with universities overseas; special training programs for foreign students at various levels; and policy-centered projects of research. To determine the even more active international role of Johns Hopkins in the coming years, stronger organization and deliberate university-wide planning appear essential.

Finally, there is a crying need in Washington for university-based graduate training and research related to domestic as well as international concerns. A center of scholarship there could not only utilize the vast archival and library resources, but could work in fruitful interchange with the living resources of makers of policy in all branches of our national government, the diplomatic corps, and the great international institutions. It could help train administrative leaders of the future, and could forge strong links between the world of government and the intellectual centers of the nation.

This implies no subservience to government, no compromise of university independence of thought or freedom to criticize. It does recognize that national government has become the greatest single factor in shaping our common destinies, that the problems and processes of government are increasingly complex and needful of intellectual analysis, and that discourse between government and the academic world can be mutually beneficial. Johns Hopkins is well situated to meet this need, either alone or perhaps better in conjunction with other like-minded institutions of high quality.

All that I have said implies that Johns Hopkins, true to its origins and its entire history, remains a university directed primarily toward graduate and professional education and research. We are neither a college onto which some graduate studies have been grafted nor a research establishment which does some teaching in its spare time. There is no conflict between research and our kind of education, because we regard students not as passive vessels to be filled with received wisdom, but as active partners in the broadening of knowledge and of understanding. And our undergraduates are not a body apart, but pre-graduate, pre-professional students integrated into the same process.

We must probably plead guilty, along with most of our sister institutions, to some neglect of undergraduates in recent years when faculty expansion has not kept step with the forced pace growth of research. One of our pressing needs is to remedy this neglect.

To say that undergraduates are pre-graduate students does not mean that they should be narrow specialists from their freshmen year, or even as juniors and seniors. The greatest scholars are not exclusively specialists; they combine inward specialization with receptivity and understanding toward other branches of learning. As we seek to cultivate intellectual greatness in embryo, our curriculum must look to such reciprocal understanding in its earliest phases. We must ensure that scientists are humanized and we must search for new methods to give to humanists a genuine appreciation of scientific method and the scientific enterprise. And as our primary and secondary schools improve their capacity to teach basic skills and to provide the fundamentals of liberal

education, we may well want to reconsider ways and means of shortening the total span of higher education. Since our students are partners, and not passive recipients, we should enlist their advice and counsel in these great questions of academic development and reform.

Although our mission is primarily intellectual, we are not and have no desire to become a community of disembodied intellects. The joys of social life, athletic prowess, political debate, community service, music, drama, and the other creative arts—all should be present in greater measure on our several campuses, not merely as spectacles but as opportunities for active participation. It should be our aim to become one of Baltimore's great centers of cultural ferment.

I said earlier that we are but a single, small partner in the rapidly expanding enterprise of American higher education. Thus far, that partnership has been reflected only feebly in organized collaboration. We are, to be sure, members of two consortia for scientific research; Associated Universities, Inc., with its nuclear energy laboratory at Brookhaven and its facilities for radioastronomy, and the new Universities Research Association, Inc., with its project for a high energy accelerator in Illinois. In coming years, many more arrangements for formal collaboration and interchange—local, regional, national, and even international—are surely to be expected. Our cordial relations with Goucher College provide the prospect of course exchanges to mutual benefit. The growing expense of libraries, computers, and specialized laboratories compels us to look to greater efficiency through a regional sharing of facilities. The scientific establishments based in Washington provide other special opportunities for fruitful cooperation. And as rapid transportation develops on the Boston-Norfolk axis, new possibilities may arise for a parcelling out of certain specialties, with consequent exchanges of graduate students and visiting professors, among the several first quality universities in this great East Coast conurbation.

These indicated lines of development suggest only a portion of what may figure in our agenda as our second century opens. Others will emerge as the long-term planning discussions continue. This is no modest agenda; nor should it be so. A huge university may depend on its sheer mass to maintain momentum. For one of our small size and special traditions, vitality depends upon continuous innovation and growth—not vast growth in student numbers, but growth in the variety and quality of what we undertake.

Against these aspirations, we share the plight of the entire family of private universities: a constraint of resources which could soon evolve into open crisis. I measure my words with care in stating that within the coming decade, unless conventional sources of financing can be greatly enlarged and major new sources made available, American private universities are destined to become a backwater of intellectual stagnation. Their continued nominal existence would then be meaningless, for they would have lost their *raison d'être*.

This may sound like panic-mongering in face of our own financial record of the last ten years. That is indeed a remarkable record. Resources have been found to multiply current budgets three and one-half fold, to restore salary levels to front rank, to make good a large portion of the backlog of deferred building, and to augment significantly the numbers of our faculties. Moreover, unlike some of our sister institutions, we are not now operating fiscally "in the red," in the sense of drawing on endowment capital for current operating expenses. But like all our fellows, we are in the red programmatically: our faculty numbers are still far too small to do well what we can and should be doing, both in established fields and in new fields of great challenge; there are not sur-

ficient funds for student aids and fellowships; and there are urgent needs for further rehabilitation and expansion of physical facilities.

Over the last ten or fifteen years, the cost per student of university education has risen by seven to eight percent a year, a rate at least triple that of cost increases in the economy as a whole. This might seem to imply gross inefficiency, but in fact it is inherent in the nature of the enterprise. Universities, especially those concentrated on graduate training and research, depend in unique measure on the personal services of exceptionally talented and highly trained human beings—the scarcest of all productive resources. There are no magical devices for spreading those resources thinly or replacing them by machines. And they must be complemented by research libraries of explosively growing size and cost, by laboratory equipment of ever greater complexity, by computer facilities of vital importance to a host of disciplines, and by building construction whose cost increases are also much more rapid than those of manufacturing or services in general.

In absolute terms, on the other hand, universities are enormously productive. The technology of nuclear power boasts of the breeder reactor, which generates more fissionable material than it consumes. Decades earlier, universities showed how to generate more intellectual material than they consume. Their contribution to national economic growth alone, to say nothing of more valuable if less measurable cultural development, far surpasses the returns to like expenditures by governmental agencies or business corporations. Universities are the basic incubators of productivity on which all other growth depends.

The dramatic expansion of recent years has entailed new kinds of financial risks. These do not lie merely in the obvious problem of dependence on governmental support for the overwhelming proportion of scientific and health-related research. Such support itself is too often conditioned on unreasonable requirements for cost-sharing out of limited general university funds. In addition, the comfortable practice of limiting long-term commitments to assured endowment income has had to yield in disquieting measure to the acceptance of ten or even five-year funding, trusting to the future somehow or other to maintain vital new components of our programs. At this very moment, we are searching for new sources to replace some of these short-lived grants. This is no easy task under current conditions, when federal programs affecting higher education are being sharply curtailed, the largest private foundation is turning away from broad institutional support to the universities, and we face the uncertain impact of selective service policy on graduate student enrollment.

Some gains can be made from improvements in management, and we are devoting strenuous efforts to this end. Our goal is management of the highest professional caliber, applied to such key factors as modernized investment policies, new techniques for cost control, more efficient utilization of space, administrative automation, and program budgeting. Despite all that can be done to improve efficiency, we see ahead evident requirements for massive additional resources on both current and capital account. Our own detailed financial projections are still under development, but a good indication of what we face can be seen from a study by Professor William Bowen of Princeton on the composite prospects of the universities of Chicago, Princeton, and Vanderbilt, which are not generically different from our own. The Bowen study indicates that by 1976—our own centennial year—the sum of tuition revenues, endowment income, and private gifts as reasonably projected from current trends will fail to cover something between twenty-eight and thirty-

ty-nine percent of essential educational and general university expenditures.

Crisis, one dictionary tells us, is "the point in the course of a serious disease at which a decisive change occurs, leading either to recovery or to death." The private universities are not quite yet at this stage, but crisis is visible over the horizon, and it will not yield to palliatives or conventional treatment. These institutions are far too precious to our society to be allowed to die, but it will take our best efforts to devise the heroic remedies to ensure their recovery. I see three possibilities, all of which must be explored to the fullest and without delay.

The first is a fundamental change in the scale of corporate support for private higher education. The principle of legitimate corporate interest in educational giving is now widely recognized. The Council for Financial Aid to Education estimates voluntary business contributions in 1966 at \$300 million, almost double the figure for 1960. But this covers only 2½ percent of annual current expenditures in higher education and amounts to only one-third of one percent of net corporate income before taxes. It is a pittance in relation to the benefits received from the training of skilled manpower and the conduct of research in the universities. We are not here pleading for charity, or suggesting mere corporate image-making. We are asking that business recognize the immense productivity of investment in education and act accordingly. A goal of one to two percent of net income before taxes would be a conservative contribution in light of the true long-run interests of the corporate community.

The second desirable new source of support is more modest in size and perhaps of only interim character. That is the State government. The Maryland Advisory Council for Higher Education has explicitly recognized the importance of a diversified pattern in which the private colleges and universities are maintained as vital entities alongside their public counterparts. For almost two centuries, the Maryland State Legislature has provided some form of aid to the private institutions, but it presently amounts to very little compared with pace-setting States such as Pennsylvania and New York. As suggested by the recent New York Select Committee on the Future of Private and Independent Higher Education, a few million dollars a year, allocated wisely and promptly, might prevent now a drastic deterioration of the private institutions which would be far more costly to repair later. Supplemental aid to the private colleges and universities, in addition to supporting diversity and quality, is much less costly to the State than provision for higher education exclusively through public institutions.

State support, however, although of great potential value in the years immediately ahead, is probably only an interim measure. As costs continue to mount, it becomes clear that under the present division of tax resources among federal, State, and local levels, even the wealthiest States will become unable to finance the massive scale of educational services demanded by the people and already in an advanced stage of development. A system of block federal grants to the States, or automatic sharing of personal and corporate income tax revenue, would of course transform this outlook. Barring such a transformation, it is evident that State and private universities alike will have to look to federal governmental support for a growing proportion of their financial needs.

Today there is scarcely debate on the concept of federal support to higher education. The debate now concerns the forms, the objectives, the allocating mechanisms, the balance between accountability and independence, the volume, and the timing. There is broad agreement that federal aid should extend both to students and to institutions, and to the latter in both categorical and general forms.

The basic national goal of access to higher education without regard to family income will require larger loan programs for the middle income groups and much larger scholarship programs for the lower income groups. I do not believe, however, that the nation would be well served by attempting to have such student aids cover the full cost of education, even at the undergraduate level and much less for graduate and professional training. There are grave accounting difficulties in calculating costs per student, but expenditures on graduate education may average four times undergraduate, while the spread from junior college to medical education may be eight times or more. The value to society of college and university training, research, and public service surely justifies substantial institutional support financed from general taxation.

This suggests some kind of formula for federal aid to all accredited institutions, coupled with categorical aid for research, construction, and facilities. In my view, such a formula should be designed to cover those incremental costs of instruction and general operations which inevitably fall upon higher education in a growing economy. A simple formula would be based on student numbers, providing differential rates for the various levels and types of education. Added to tuition, student fees, and State appropriations for the public institutions, it should cover normal costs of instruction and general operations in full, leaving endowment income and private gifts to be applied to innovation, experimentation, and the unending pursuit of excellence.

Categorical support, on the other hand, would continue to be justified to competent agencies and their professional advisers, case by case, on the merits of specific projects for research, building, or facilities. For such facilities as libraries, advanced laboratories, and computers, it would be not only legitimate but indispensable for the financing agencies to require institutional cooperation and regional rationalization as a condition of assistance.

Does this vision of Federal support imply the extinction of private universities as we have known them, or their merger into a single national system along with, and indistinguishable from, the State universities? Such a development is conceivable, as Dr. Alan Pifer has recently suggested, but I believe it neither probable nor desirable. The American private university is one of the great social inventions of all time. Its quintessence is not privateness in the sense of irresponsibility or disregard of the public weal. Its trustees have always recognized that theirs is a public trust. It is rather the capacity of each university to define its public responsibilities and to devise its own ways of meeting them which has given unique character and strength to our system of higher education. This is the real meaning of private freedom and independence. Of course we should demand the same respect for academic freedom in the public as in the private institutions. But academic freedom is one thing and institutional freedom another. To be financially beholden to the state is not necessarily to be of the state. And I have confidence that we can find the wisdom to devise a system of governmental support which respects the people's interest in the proper use of public monies while maintaining the quintessential freedom of the private university.

This would not be possible if financial dependence upon government were to become total. Not only in these wintry times, but also in the springtime which we all hope may ultimately come with peace in Southeast Asia, the distinctiveness of the Hopkins—our continued capacity to contribute uniquely our genius to the benefit of America and mankind—will depend on the loyal support of our alumni and our friends. We

need that support every day, at this moment more than ever for reasons I have mentioned. And within a year, we shall be launching, in conjunction with The Johns Hopkins Hospital, a major centennial capital campaign. Its success will be vital to the kind of university which should carry the great name of Johns Hopkins into our own second century and the nation's third.

Mr. Chairman, we hold this ceremony at a difficult moment in our national history. This tranquil retreat does not shield us from the sound of guns and bombs in Vietnam, the struggles for true racial equality, the needs for urban reconstruction, the determination of restless continents to find their place in the sun, the disaffection of a part of our youth, the searching for new aesthetic and moral standards and for new purpose. The moment of our origin ninety-two years ago was no easier. In 1876, a war-ravaged South was still occupied by federal armies. The disputed Presidential election later that year came close to breaking the country asunder for the second time. Yet our forebears lifted their vision at that moment to create an institution devoted to scholarly and professional excellence—a new prototype which added innovation to the ancient university function of cultural conservation.

Whatever the future may now bring, we can say with confidence, short of an all-destroying nuclear holocaust, that it will desperately need the qualities we here seek to foster: intellectual curiosity and discipline; intelligence trained at the frontiers of unfolding knowledge but infused with humanity; dedication combined with objectivity; operational idealism; the search for truth, not only for its own sake but because, in the words adopted as our motto, "the truth shall make you free."

In his inaugural address, Daniel Gilman suggested twelve points to guide his fledgling institution. The twelfth was succinctly stated. He said: "Universities easily fall into ruts. Almost every epoch requires a fresh start." You and your fellow Board members, Mr. Chairman, have entrusted to me the leadership of one more in the series of fresh starts which have given to The Johns Hopkins University its capacity for permanent regeneration.

This is not an easy mandate, but it is lightened by your support and the support of all this great community of friends. I shall do what I can to be faithful to your trust.

George H. Kocyan

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1968

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago today a very good friend of mine and a fine public servant passed away. George Kocyan led an active and productive life. He was a leader among men and a true patriot. He was a member of a very prominent and well-known family in the Greater Wilkes-Barre community. His brother is one of the most outstanding physicians in the northeastern part of Pennsylvania. George Kocyan has indeed been greatly missed since his passing, not only by the members of his immediate family and close relatives, but also by his many longtime associates of the various organizations in which he played leading roles. Out of further respect and recognition to George Kocyan, Mr. Speaker, I include as part of my remarks today a tribute to him which appeared in

the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader Evening News on March 8, 1967:

[From the Times Leader, Wilkes-Barre, Pa., Mar. 8, 1967]

G. H. KOCYAN PASSES AWAY; RETIRED COUNTY EMPLOYEE, RITES SATURDAY

A former chief clerk in the office of the Luzerne County Clerk of Courts, George H. Kocyan, of 221 Lathrop Street, Kingston, died last night in General Hospital, after being taken ill at his home.

Active in the Republican party, Mr. Kocyan was employed at the courthouse 25 years, and was chief clerk in the Clerk of Courts office from March 1, 1956, until his retirement in 1962. He previously was minute-clerk.

Mr. Kocyan was active in Polish Union affairs many years and was vice president of the organization. He served as general chairman and in other capacities many years for the annual picnics of District 16 of the Polish Union and was noted for his efforts in connection with Gen. Pulaski commemorative programs. He was a member of the Kosciuszko Foundation of New York; Pulaski Memorial Committee of Wyoming Valley; Tatara Club of Luzerne County; Sarmatina Club of SS. Peter and Paul's Church, Plains; Polish Union, Group 69, Plains; member and treasurer of Gmina 16, Plains. He also was a member of American Legion Post 132, Wilkes-Barre; Hudson Sporting Club, Henry Club of Plains and the Elks Club of Wilkes-Barre.

A native of Baltimore, Mr. Kocyan lived in Kingston most of his life. He was a veteran of World War I, in which he served in France, and received the Purple Heart. He was a member of SS. Peter and Paul's Church, Plains, and a communicant of St. Hedwig's Church, Kingston.

Surviving are his wife, the former Sophia Dembitz, son, George, Jr., engineer for TRW Systems, Washington, D.C.; five grandchildren; brother, Dr. Joseph J. Kocyan, Wilkes-Barre; sister, Mrs. Katherine Dunkel, Topeka, Kans.

Funeral will be held Saturday morning at 10 from the Kopicki Funeral Home, 53 Hudson Road, Plains Township, with a Requiem Mass at 10:30 in SS. Peter and Paul's Church. Interment will be in Mt. Olivet Cemetery, Carverton.

Friends may call Thursday night 7 to 10, and Friday 2 to 4 and 7 to 10.

Sarmatina Men's Club will recite the Rosary Friday at 8:30 p.m.

Citizens in Action Against Crime—It Can Be Done

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 7, 1968

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, today in many communities, private groups and individuals in cooperation with their local law-enforcement officials are making important contributions toward combating crime. Women's groups in Indianapolis established one of the most effective and outstanding programs in this country—a model now followed in communities across the Nation.

At the White House Conference on What Citizens Can Do To Help Insure Safe Streets, Mrs. Margaret More, whose energetic leadership helped to build the Indianapolis program, outlined to the First Lady and other women leaders the specific steps citizens can take in the fight against crime.

I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from Mrs. More's remarks be printed in the Extensions of Remarks, so that more citizens and communities may have the benefit of these valuable recommendations.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Crime prevention and law enforcement are the duties of every American. There are many fields of crime prevention in which women, as well as men, can have great impact.

Here is a program which you can use in your community—large or small.

(1) Find out how bad crime really is in your community. Visit your police department, your sheriff, your town marshal or the nearest state police headquarters. Have a list of questions ready to ask. Find out whether crime is increasing, how many people in your community actually are involved in crime, whether juvenile crime is increasing and what people are doing about all of this. Check frequently with your law enforcement officials. Ask how you can help.

(2) Take a look at lighting in your city or town. Can you help with lighting surveys? (Crime goes down as much as 85% where there is adequate lighting). Is the area around your church well-lighted? Around your home? How about the streets of your city or town?

(3) Take a look at your courts—or court—as the case may be. Find out what courts you have and how the judges are chosen. Visit your courts. Find out what happens there. You may be surprised how many defendants appear with great frequency, how many young people are charged with crimes, how many youths in courts are dropouts, how many cases are continued or delayed. Why not plan a court-watching program—one in which you schedule two women a day into your municipal, criminal and juvenile courts—not to look at specific cases, but to observe patterns. Talk with your judges. Ask how you can be of service.

(4) Much legislation concerns law enforcement. Perhaps other legislation should be introduced. Study proposed laws. Talk with your legislators. Between sessions of your legislature, look for areas which need the attention of the public as well as legislators. Keep in touch with law-making as it affects crime prevention. As citizens, you can and should be interested in legislation.

(5) Find out how many dropouts you have in your city or town. Even if you don't have a major problem, your help may be needed. Dropouts can't get jobs, they are idle and they get into trouble. Work with your school administrators in getting dropouts back in school. In Indianapolis, women working on a personal basis—one woman with one youth—have been able to help more than 2,000 young people to return to school—without tax funds. You also can help young adults who have dropped out to return to school and complete their high school education. Assist them in finding vocational training . . . preparatory to jobs.

(6) Clothing often is needed for dropouts. Set up a clothing room in your church—a room where people of the church and community can bring good, used, clean clothing suitable for young people. Make sure that a volunteer group helping dropouts to return to school knows about the clothing room. Arrange to have volunteers at the room certain hours each week after school.

(7) Help young people to find jobs; urge them also to participate in some kind of service in hospitals, clinics, settlement houses, day nurseries. Judges say that few youths who give part of their time to service get into trouble. Write a simple "Directory for Teen-Age Service," and mimeograph copies.

(8) Set up a study room in your church for young people and children who have no place

at home to study. Arrange for free tutoring in English, math, science, history and other subjects. Many former teachers and retired teachers enjoy work of this sort a few hours a week.

(9) Find out how many people in your city or town can't read. You'll be surprised how many people can't even tell whether a bus goes "Crosstown" or "Central." You'll be surprised how many parents can't read their children's first grade books. Set up literacy classes. There are many methods—Laubach (each one teach one:) Board for Fundamental Education plan: "Direct Approach to Reading," and many others.

(10) Meet with parole officers and other corrections officials and ask to help youths released from correctional institutions. Police records show that approximately 35 per cent of juvenile offenders are repeaters, usually charged with two offenses. These youths need help in order to adjust to law-abiding life in their communities. One boy stole a shirt two days after he was released from a correctional school. Why? He didn't have a shirt. An 18-year-old girl stayed in the school 8 months after her release because she had no home to go to.

(11) There are laws for children . . . but few children and few adults are familiar with their state statutes affecting juveniles. Ask your police or write to your Secretary of State—for copies of the statutes. Talk with school officials and police in order to arrange a program whereby police can go into classrooms and talk to children about the laws which affect them.

(12) Begin a spruce-up campaign in one area, and enlist the help of women throughout the city to make the program city-wide. A clean city is a law-abiding city. Good housekeeping is a crime deterrent.

(13) Find out whether your police department has a recruiting problem. Can the department recruit men outside your town or city? Are college courses offered at times when policemen can take advantage of them. Ask a policeman to speak at a church family night program. Ask him how you can help the police department.

(14) Take precaution to protect yourself and your family. Don't invite crime into your car—or into your home.

(15) Approximately 50 per cent of the youths in trouble have no church affiliation—but 50 per cent do have some affiliation. Work with young people in your church—and those who might be interested.

On the Playing Fields of Oakland

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 7, 1968

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, Oakland, Calif., is the place about which Gertrude Stein once said, "There is no 'there' there." But no more.

Today Oakland sports one of the most modern and well-designed exhibition and athletic complexes in the country. Its football team is champion of the American Football League. And the city's prospects for growing sports supremacy are bright.

Even the highly regarded international journal, the Economist of London, has in its issue of February 24, 1968, paid tribute to the city. Says the Economist:

Oakland's newly acquired "big league" status may not be a match for San Francisco's tourist attractions. But Mr. Edgar Kaiser and other Oakland leaders who fought hard to get the coliseum complex have clearly stolen just a little of San Francisco's glory.

By the unanimous consent of my colleagues, I include this article from the *Economist* in the *RECORD* at this point:

ON THE PLAYING FIELDS OF OAKLAND
(From a correspondent in California)

Little as most people around the country have heard about Oakland, Oakland wishes that they had heard less than they have. Its chief landmark seems to be the Army Induction Centre—the focal point of some of the most intense demonstrations against the war. To many students at the nearby Berkeley branch of the University of California, Oakland, is epitomized by Mr. William Knowland. The former Republican leader in the Senate publishes the *Oakland Tribune*, which looks askance at demonstrators and favourably on police who disperse them briskly and with force.

So what does a place like Oakland do about its image? It builds a new sports stadium and indoor arena. It then fills them with professional players of just about every sport going. The "coliseum complex" is barely more than a year old yet it is already graced by five teams, representing soccer, football, ice hockey, basketball and baseball, the most recent arrival. The baseball team is the transplanted Kansas City Athletics, one of the American League's also-rans.

All of this is very disturbing to San Francisco. For years, San Franciscans have looked upon Oakland as that bad dream on the wrong side of the bay. They have been known to quote Gertrude Stein's comment about Oakland: "There is no 'there' there." San Francisco, with a population of 750,000, is nearly twice as big as Oakland. More important, it has cable cars, night life and an active financial centre. How can Oakland, with none of these, be taken seriously? The answer is that it cannot—and has not been. Its plans for the sports centre were scoffed at.

Now some of the barbs are flying back across the bay. The new 12,500-seat arena promptly enabled Oakland to steal San Francisco's ice hockey team away from the smaller Cow Palace (better known for political conventions). Worse treason, the star of San Francisco's fine basketball team has chosen to switch to the new Oakland team. And now, to pile embarrassment on embarrassment, the Raiders, Oakland's entry in the American Football League, are drawing more spectators to the new 53,000-seat stadium than San Francisco's Forty-niners, long-established members of the older National Football League, are able to attract in their city. While the Forty-niners won only half of their games, Oakland lost only once all season and won its league's championship (only to be crushed by the Green Bay Packers of the NFL).

The Raider's success at the box office serves to call attention to something seldom mentioned in San Francisco. That is the fact that the region around Oakland on the east side of the bay is growing twice as rapidly as that around San Francisco on the west side. Counting from San José at the southern end of the bay, Oakland's side already boasts a population of 2.6 million with 3.3 million forecast by 1975. The west side has only 1.5 million with 1.7 million forecast.

This makes it less surprising that the coliseum complex has met with such rapid success. With every seat in the arena sold for performances by such musical stars as Mr. Sammy Davis, Jr., and for the Moscow Circus, the complex produced \$1,250,000 in revenue in its first year. This was \$300,000 more than was needed to cover expenses, excluding debt repayment. Few people thought a surplus was possible, at least before Oakland had a major league baseball team (the Athletics arrived only in time for the recent season). Thus, there is hope that the city and the county governments will not have to find all of the \$1.5 million a year which they have promised to help pay off the \$25.5 million in bonds sold to finance the project.

Oakland is already getting some of the broader benefits which supporters of the project predicted. Both the Hilton hotel chain and Holiday Inns plan new 200-room motel units near the stadium. That is more new accommodation than Oakland has seen in decades. The complex is also stimulating traffic at Oakland's airport, which boasts a small but increasing number of non-stop commercial flights to New York and other distant points. (Traffic at the San Francisco airport is still ten times heavier, however.)

Oakland's newly acquired "big league" status may not be a match for San Francisco's tourist attractions. But Mr. Edgar Kaiser (who is following his father's footsteps as head of the Kaiser industrial empire) and other Oakland leaders who fought hard to get the coliseum complex have clearly stolen just a little of San Francisco's glory.

Tragic Death of Charleston Postmaster Roland F. Wooten, Jr.

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 7, 1968

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on February 25, 1968, America lost one of its great heroes of World War II when a plane crash snuffed out the life of Roland F. Wooten, Jr., postmaster at Charleston, S.C. In his death I have lost a close personal friend, and the Nation has lost a dedicated public servant who achieved fame and success mainly because of an intense sense of patriotism and a willingness to work hard. Of all the men whose names come to memory at this point, it can be said with truthfulness that Roland Wooten was one who knew hardship but used it as a steppingstone to success.

His death was a shock to all who were associated with him because he was so full of life and he enjoyed people and their happiness as much as his own. My sympathy goes out to all the members of his family.

Roland Wooten was America's first ace of World War II, and his record of missions and kills was one of the most outstanding of the war. In an editorial published in the *Columbia, S.C., Record* of February 27, 1968, the editor noted:

He was twice shot down and twice wounded, and then returned to the States to join Jack Dempsey, the former world boxing champion, in a nationwide War Bond tour. That was the beginning of a close, lifelong friendship between the bantam flier and the heavyweight celebrity. Dempsey visited Wooten often in recent years in Charleston and at Wooten's St. Stephen home.

Following the war bond tour, Wooten volunteered to return to action in Europe. He was again shot down, badly wounded, and remained in a German prisoner-of-war camp for the remainder of the war.

Representative MENDEL RIVERS said of Roland Wooten:

Filled with indomitable courage and motivating spirit for a greater world, he came from the humblest part of America to fight with honor and determination for the safety of his fellow man.

An editorial published in the *Charleston News & Courier* of Tuesday, February 27, 1968, stated:

The *News and Courier* counts itself among those who will remember Roland Wooten with admiration for his wartime courage, and with friendship in his peacetime activities. Among his hobbies was calculation of political odds, according to a technique learned during service with Lloyd's of London. We shall miss our conversations about these and other matters of public concern.

Roland Wooten always impressed me as a man of courage and principle. He was also a reasonable man and one in whom responsibility was well placed. He believed in States rights, local government, and individual liberty in the tradition of the early Founding Fathers of this Republic. He also believed in a strong national defense and that the best way to preserve peace was to be strong and firm.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorials and the article announcing Roland Wooten's death, published in the *News & Courier* of February 26, 1968, be printed in the *Extensions of Remarks*.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the *RECORD* as follows:

[From the *Columbia (S.C.) Record*,
Feb. 27, 1968]

ROLAND WOOTEN, AMERICAN HERO

When Charleston Postmaster Roland F. Wooten was killed Sunday in an airplane crash, America lost a legendary military hero.

Pint-sized Wooten left St. Stephen to enter The Citadel during the Depression Years. His only uniform was an oversize hand-me-down. Told that he would have to buy a proper fit or leave, he appealed on grounds that he could not afford both a new uniform and the expenses of remaining in the military college. By special dispensation of Gen. Charles P. Summerall, the president, he was allowed to stay and wear the second-hand suit that had been given to him.

After graduation he went on to become the first United States Ace of World War II. He flew about 200 missions and received 25 medals in addition to foreign decorations. His record of missions and kills was one of the greatest of the war.

He was twice shot down and twice wounded, then returned to the States to join Jack Dempsey, the former world boxing champion, in a nationwide War Bond tour. That was the beginning of a close, lifelong friendship between the bantam flier and the heavyweight celebrity. Dempsey visited Wooten often in recent years in Charleston and at Wooten's St. Stephen home.

Wooten volunteered to return to action in Europe after the Bond drive. He was again shot down, badly wounded, and remained in a German prisoner-of-war camp the remainder of the conflict.

A year and a half ago he was honored at a Charleston testimonial dinner of the Fearless Men Club as the exemplification of the finest traditions of The Citadel.

Wooten's closest friend was Congressman L. Mendel Rivers, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee. When Wooten was considered for the Charleston postmastership, there were other strong applicants, but Rivers' response was, "Show me the man whose record is better than Wooten's, and we'll hire him."

"In Vietnam as in Europe," Congressman Rivers said at Wooten's testimonial dinner, "a generation of Americans has a rendezvous with destiny. We won in Europe the hard way. Now, we seek not victory but talks at a conference table. The art of warfare is lost in the Pentagon and the State Department because we are afraid of victory. We seek excuses not to destroy North Vietnam for fear of offending the Russians and Red Chinese. I subscribe to the philosophy of the pursuit

of victory held by Roland Wooten, who flew through flak and shell to gain it.

"Filled with indomitable courage and motivating spirit for a greater world, he came from the humblest part of America to fight with honor and determination for the safety of his fellow man."

That tribute now becomes Roland Wooten's memorial.

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News and Courier, Feb. 27, 1968]

ROLAND WOOTEN

A decorated flier in World War II and a friend of notables in this country and abroad, Roland Wooten was a patriot and an interesting personality. For nearly eight years he had been postmaster at Charleston. His death at age 52 in the crash of a small plane coming in for a solo landing at Charleston brings an ironic and sorrowful end to a busy life.

The News and Courier counts itself among those who will remember Roland Wooten with admiration for his wartime courage, and with friendship in his peacetime activities. Among his hobbies was calculation of political odds, according to a technique learned during service with Lloyd's of London. We shall miss our conversations about these and other matters of public concern.

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News and Courier, Feb. 28, 1968]

ROLAND WOOTEN DIES IN PLANE CRASH— POSTMASTER KILLED INSTANTLY IN PILEUP AT AIR FORCE BASE

(By Stewart R. King)

Charleston Postmaster Roland F. Wooten Jr., 52, was killed instantly last night when a light private aircraft he was piloting crashed at Charleston Air Force Base.

The former air ace, who had survived six major airplane crashes in World War II was approaching the main runway when the single-engine Beechcraft Bonanza apparently struck a treetop and spun into the ground.

Air Force personnel found his body still strapped in the pilot's seat. Severe head and chest injuries caused instantaneous death, County Coroner Jennings Cauthen said last night.

Wooten, a native of St. Stephen who became postmaster at Charleston in April 1960, was alone in the four-seater plane.

He was returning from Daytona Beach, Fla., where he had been attending a stock car race.

Joseph Moluf Jr. of Charleston said he talked with Wooten and his brother at about 3:35 p.m. as they were on their way to Ormond Beach, Fla., where Wooten had left the plane.

"We were both in a rush. We talked for about two minutes—just shooting the breeze," Moluf said.

Edward E. Wooten of Daytona Beach said his brother arrived there Sunday morning. He met his brother at the airport and they attended the races.

After the races he and his wife drove Roland to their home for a meal, then took him to his plane.

"Everything was fine. He was in extremely good spirits when he left here," Edward said. "He was planning to spend the night with a friend, Judge Hemphill."

U.S. Rep. L. Mendel Rivers, a long-time friend of Wooten's was at the races, but he flew back to Washington with Alan S. Boyd, Secretary of Transportation, Edward Wooten said.

W. K. Wessels, chief controller at Charleston Municipal Airport, said Wooten had been given a landing clearance from control tower and was making a normal approach when his plane disappeared from the radar screen.

The plane was found by air base rescue workers about 300 yards north of Runway 15. The left wing of the aircraft was mangled

and the front was left a twisted heap of wreckage.

Wessels said the Bonanza (3206 V) had been registered to Rep. Rivers.

An Air Force Base spokesman said last night the plane Wooten was piloting was normally parked on a "space available" basis at the aero club at the air base because Wooten was an associate member of the club.

The spokesman said the plane was registered in the name of Wooten.

Wooten's body was taken to the air base dispensary, then transferred to Charleston County Emergency Room. Cauthen said an autopsy would be performed at the request of the Federal Aviation Agency.

Wooten is survived by his father Roland F. Wooten Sr. of St. Stephen; a daughter, Miss Mamie Wooten of Charleston; a son, Roland F. Wooten III of Charleston; four brothers, John R. Wooten, Carl Marshall Wooten and James Wooten, all of St. Stephen, and Edward F. Wooten of Daytona Beach, Fla.

Wooten, South Carolina's first air ace in World War II, was honored at the first awards banquet of the Fearless Men's Club here in October of 1966.

A 1936 graduate of The Citadel, Wooten preceded the United States into the war when he arrived in England in April 1942 with the first contingent of American pilots to enter the European war theater.

He fought with the Royal Air Force for many months.

The Spitfire fighter team of "Wooten and Winkler" established a record among American pilots in England and Africa with more than 130 combat missions completed before they "retired" in 1943.

Wooten was shot down three times and survived six major airplane crashes during wartime.

It was Wooten who led the Spitfires which took Winston Churchill to the "unconditional surrender" conference at Casablanca.

John M. Winkler, now a colonel, was one of the 200 persons who attended the awards banquet.

After flying almost 200 combat missions, Wooten returned to the United States and was rated by Gen. Arnold, then Chief of Air Forces "one of the top airmen of World War II."

Assigned to bonds tours in 1943 and 1945, Wooten struck up a friendship with another bonds campaigner, former heavyweight boxing champion Jack Dempsey.

Wooten, who ended the war a major, took over as acting postmaster at Charleston in April of 1960, and his appointment was confirmed in September of 1961.

He was nominated by President Kennedy on the recommendation of Rep. Rivers. He took over on the retirement of the late Edmund P. Grice.

"America has lost one of her truly great war heroes of all time," commented Senator Rembert Dennis of Berkeley County. "It is a terrible loss to the country and to the community, and I have lost a most valued personal friend," the senator added.

Lester Bates, mayor of Columbia, said that he very much regrets this accident. "I consider him one of my best friends, and I will come to his funeral," the mayor concluded.

"Charleston and the nation have lost a great soldier-citizen," stated Federal District Judge Robert W. Hemphill. "He is one of the finest men I have ever known, and we all sympathize with his bereaved family," Hemphill said.

WOOTEN LOVED THRILL OF FLYING

A decision made more than a year ago by Charleston Postmaster Roland F. Wooten Jr. was a fateful one. He decided to start flying regularly again after several years of comparative inactivity as a pilot.

Wooten had logged thousands of hours of flying time in World War II as a fighter pilot.

He also had flown a great deal before the war as a private pilot. He continued to fly after the war, but when he became postmaster at Charleston he curtailed his flying activities considerably.

Shortly after 7 p.m. Sunday, Wooten was bringing his single-engine Beechcraft Bonanza in for a landing at Charleston Air Force Base when the plane apparently struck a tree top and crashed. Wooten was killed instantly in the crash, according to Charleston County Coroner Jennings Cauthen.

A close friend of the postmaster's said yesterday that flying was one of Wooten's first loves. For more than a year, he had been deeply involved in bringing himself up to date on all the latest flying techniques. He had done a great deal of night flying and instrument flying.

Last June he flew to New York to help his brother John celebrate his birthday.

The airplane in which Wooten crashed belonged to him. He and U.S. Rep. L. Mendel Rivers had bought the plane together. Rivers, a close friend and confidante of Wooten's, said yesterday he recently sold his interest in the plane to the postmaster.

Wooten kept the plane at the Charleston Air Force Base Aero Club, where he was an associate member by virtue of his status as a retired Air Force officer. Federal Aviation Agency investigators confirmed yesterday that the plane belonged to Wooten. Papers showed that full ownership of the plane recently had been transferred to Wooten.

Rivers also said he had flown "hundreds of times" with Wooten. The congressman said he considered Wooten an excellent pilot.

After the crash Sunday night, there was some fear among local military and civilian officials that Rivers himself had been aboard the plane with Wooten. But Rivers told reporters in Washington yesterday that there never were any plans for him to fly back to Charleston with Wooten. Rivers flew straight to Washington from Daytona Beach, Fla., where he and Wooten had witnessed the Daytona 500-mile stock car race.

"I would have flown with Roland. If I'd been going to Charleston," Rep. Rivers said yesterday in Washington. "He was a great pilot. Something must have been wrong with the plane. But I had to hurry here for a meeting of my committee and made other arrangements."

"South Carolina has lost one of its most courageous and gallant sons," Rivers said. "He was one of the highest decorated pilots in World War II. . . . He was a dedicated public servant and a loyal friend. I'm going to miss him. My sympathies go out to his immediate family."

The 52-year-old Wooten retired from the Air Force with the rank of major after World War II. He had flown more than 200 missions in Europe and survived six major air crashes in the war.

Wooten returned to the United States in 1943 after months as a fighter pilot in combat and made a swing through the country to promote the sale of U.S. War Bonds. He then returned to combat in 1944 and later was shot down and spent the remainder of the war in a prison camp.

A friend of the family said yesterday that Wooten was more proud of his longevity as a pilot in the war than he was of the number of enemy planes he shot down—14.

He spent eight months in a German prisoner-of-war camp and was The Citadel's most decorated alumnus of World War II. He was graduated from The Citadel in 1936.

Wooten held the Distinguished Flying Cross with cluster, Air Medal and 21 Oak Leaf Clusters and the Purple Heart with cluster. He also held the International Order of the Flying Foot (RAF) and the Polish Eagle (Ace's Emblem). He joined the British Royal Air Force before the United States entered the war and after switched to the U.S. Army Air Corps.

After the war, Wooten returned to the job

he held before the war, that of insurance representative with Mather and Co. of Philadelphia, a subsidiary of Lloyds of London. He was a traveling engineer for the Philadelphia firm after the war and held that job until shortly before he became postmaster at Charleston.

For a short time before he became postmaster, Wooten operated a business and tax advisory service at 181 Savannah Highway. The firm was known as Roland F. Wooten Associates.

He came to Charleston about 12 years ago and took over as acting postmaster in April 1960. His appointment was confirmed in September 1961 and he had been postmaster since.

Wooten was born Sept. 16, 1915, in Andrews, a son of Roland F. Wooten and Mrs. Minnie Marshall Wooten. He spent his boyhood in St. Stephen.

He was a member of John Wesley Methodist Church and a former member of the church's official board.

Funeral services will take place at 2:30 p.m. tomorrow at John Wesley Church on Savannah Highway. Burial will be at Sunset Memorial Park in St. Stephen at 4:30 p.m., directed by Stuhls.

Surviving are his father; a daughter, Miss Mimi Wooten; a son, Roland F. Wooten III, both of Charleston; four brothers, John R. Wooten, Carl M. Wooten and James Wooten, all of St. Stephen, and Edward E. Wooten of Daytona Beach, Fla.

Voice of Democracy

HON. JOHN JARMAN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1968

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a copy of the winning speech in the Oklahoma State competition for the Voice of Democracy contest. The contest is conducted each year by the Veterans of Foreign Wars and its ladies auxiliary, and I was very pleased to learn that a member of my congressional district, Miss Linda Diane Farrell, is this year's winner in our State's competition.

I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate Miss Farrell not only for her excellent writing abilities, but also for the fundamental beliefs in America that she has set forward. I commend this speech for the reading of my colleagues, and include Miss Farrell's speech in the RECORD:

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

I am Freedom. You know me. I've been with your country since the first day you set foot on American soil. I've watched you prosper and grow from a country fighting for an ideal into a country living that ideal, and finally, into a country losing sight of that ideal.

It seems you no longer love me anymore—not like you used to. I can remember when people used to gather in large numbers on July 4th and cry openly as my symbol, the American Flag, was marched by. I can remember how they would think about me when there was no flag present—that flag was in their hearts and in their minds. I think of the times proud Americans would stand behind their leaders and give them strength when my name was threatened. I can remember when people campaigned with all their hearts for a competent leader of their country—and then voted for that leader at the following election. I can still hear the voices of young, old, and middle-aged men and women singing fervently,

"America the Beautiful", and believing every word they sang.

I think of other things too, I think of the thousands and millions of men and women and even children who gave their life's blood to see America fulfill my name. I think of hundreds and thousands who gave the sad moans and tears of their heart when this blood was shed. I think of simple people who fought every day of their life silently, through just working to build this nation into the vast, free economy it is.

But today I see a much different picture. My name is akin to unreserve, unrestraint, and uncontrol. It is no longer seen as something to be earned, but rather something to be given away freely. No longer do I hear cries of "To keep freedom you must work for it." Now the cry is "I want my freedom and I want it given to me, I'm an individual, and I deserve it."

The fact is, I don't come Free—along with me comes an awful lot of sheer hard work. To receive my benefits you must earn first my respect. I'm too important to hand my rewards out to just anyone. Too many people have lived and died for me. Too many people once cared so much that they would sacrifice all they had to see me live. Too many had too much responsibility to make sure that I would be around today for you and your children.

And that word, responsibility, is my challenge to you. In that word is everything you need to once again become the Nation I used to love and stand by. The hard work, the devotion, the years of labor, the determined lives stifled, the pitiful heart cries; these all showed a great deal of keen responsibility—to one's country, one's family, and one's self. A drive to make better the land and lives of those all around, a drive to help all of mankind find a better world, and a drive to make all the dreams and hopes I stand for become realities.

I challenge you then to become that citizen. I challenge you to work for me every minute of every day. I challenge you to do just the simple things a Proud American should do, like voting for leaders who will make the country what you want and supporting those leaders after you've voted for them; supporting your country in its endeavors to help other countries remain free; and, very important, becoming so responsible that you realize what you do individually affects the whole country.

I, Freedom, send this challenge out to all of America—this plea for a Proud Country of Americans who are able to lift up their heads and say, from their hearts, "I live in America . . . I am part of America, the land of Freedom!" Then I'd like to see a tear come in the eye of each one—then I'd know you do still love me—then I'd never die.

The 53d Annual National Orange Show

HON. JERRY L. PETTIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1968

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, may I call the attention of my distinguished colleagues to the fact that today, Thursday, March 7, marks the opening of the 53d Annual National Orange Show in the city of San Bernardino, in the 33d Congressional District of California.

Today, buildings and grounds of this great permanent exhibition center cover 157 acres. Here growers of California citrus exhibit their choicest fruits in competition for National Orange Show awards on the basis of excellence of quality. Here, the 4-H Clubs and Future

Farmers of America conduct a junior fair.

This National Orange Show also annually sponsors the Citrus Institute, which was established in 1914 as the first roundtable conference for citrus growers, packers, shippers, and scientists concerned with the problems, the growth, and improvements of southern California's industry in which the growers of the 33d Congressional District have played a leading part.

In addition to its outstanding agricultural exhibits, this 1968 National Orange Show will feature numerous other interesting and informative displays, such as an all-California art show, an international photo exhibition, a hobby show, a flower and garden show, a custom car show, entertainment, and many worthwhile commercial exhibits.

It is clear, I believe, that the National Orange Show, which is truly national in character, is one of the outstanding events of this kind anywhere in the United States.

Yet, this institution represents more than merely a display of California's agricultural prowess and exhibits of interest to every American. The facilities of the National Orange Show, housed in tremendous fields—and concrete structures, placed in handsome landscape grounds, serve the year around for many other functions and activities in the 33d Congressional District.

I dare say there is not a single organized activity in the entire district that has not at least sent representatives to attend functions held in the facilities of the National Orange Show. Many of these organizations have held their own annual meetings and exhibits in the orange show facilities.

It is this constant, year-around use of the buildings and grounds for all sorts of community functions and activities which, in my opinion, sets the National Orange Show apart from other great California exhibition centers. It provides a great community service, as well as offering the public of all the United States one of the finest agricultural and cultural exhibits, dedicated in this annual National Orange Show through the history, romance, and progress of the California citrus industry.

May I, Mr. Speaker, on this occasion of the formal opening of the National Orange Show, extend a special invitation to all Members of the Congress to visit this exhibit, which will continue from March 7 through March 17 and which has as its theme this year: "Symphony and Citrus."

Freedom Attacked by U.S. Justice Department

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1968

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the attack on freedom by Solicitor General Erwin Griswold should open many eyes as to the sinister plans and ideas of some in high Government position.

Can any American conceive of such a revolting idea as individual freedom being argued by an appointed Federal employee as unconstitutional?

The Socialist idea behind destruction of individual freedom must be that individuals, given a free choice, act by personal desire and will not comply with the dream-world theories the social mechanics prescribe.

But then, through history, all tyrants and dictators have feared freedom. And there seems no exception to the tyranny of intellectuals.

Time was when the position of U.S. Solicitor General called for a duty to preserve the Constitution and to defend the laws of the United States.

Times have changed. Now the national defender exploits his high position not to defend but to seek overthrow of our laws by asking the Supreme Court to declare the laws unconstitutional. The Solicitor General now is reduced to just another revolutionary activist. The Department of forced justice may soon be renamed the Department of Injustice.

I include the article from the March 1 Washington Post following my remarks:

FREE-CHOICE PLANS ATTACKED BY JUSTICE

(By John P. MacKenzie)

"Freedom of choice" pupil-assignment plans, the most popular method of slowing the pace of school desegregation in the South, were condemned by the Justice Department yesterday as a form of state-encouraged private discrimination.

In a brief filed in the Supreme Court, Solicitor General Erwin N. Griswold said the freedom of choice plans, if they do not lead to abolition of separate white-Negro school systems, are just as unconstitutional as the state-enforced segregation rules the Court struck down in 1954.

The 17-page friend-of-the-Court brief, filed in three pending school cases from Southern and border states, was the Government's strongest official criticism of free-choice plans in recent school litigation. Some of its reasoning was considered potentially applicable to Northern schools.

Under the free-choice plan, pupils or their parents are permitted or required to choose their public schools or transfer to schools of their choice. In practice—and inevitably, according to civil rights groups—white children choose predominantly white schools and Negro children are reluctant to seek transfers from Negro schools.

The 5th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals, which handles most school litigation in Deep South states, has declared that only plans that "actually work" to eliminate racially identified schools will pass constitutional tests. Three cases before the Court involve the applicability of similar standards to nine other Southern and border states, including Maryland and Virginia.

Griswold suggested that the Court might want to go beyond the 5th Circuit's rulings to make clear that the Constitution forbids student assignment plans "which predictably, if not designedly, cater to the preference of white students to avoid desegregated schools."

"The State cannot gratuitously take steps to make discrimination easy," Griswold said. "The 14th Amendment bars State action which unnecessarily creates opportunities for the play of private prejudice."

Griswold said state government involvement in school discrimination "is not limited to situations in which the State teaches a philosophy of racial inferiority by expressly compelling segregation. The same message can be conveyed by lesser measures and they are equally forbidden."

The Solicitor General said pupil assignment is traditionally a government function that cannot be delegated to private persons to lend "encouragement" to segregation, especially when geographic zoning and other "more promising alternatives" are easily available.

Supporting the contentions of the NAACP Defense Fund, Griswold said geographic zoning or school "pairing" plans should be ordered for schools in New Kent County, Va., and Gould, Ark.

He said courts should direct authorities in Jackson, Tenn., to redraw "gerrymandered" district lines and eliminate a "free transfer" provision there.

Gardner Calls for Budget Cuts in Non-essential Areas To Allow for \$250 Million Increase in Federal Housing for the Poor

HON. JAMES C. GARDNER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1968

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I joined yesterday with eight of my Republican colleagues in the House to call for a massive \$6.5 billion cut of nonessential items in the President's budget that would allow Congress to redirect \$2.5 billion to meet urgent human needs and urban crisis in our Nation.

This administration has consistently refused to exercise the political integrity required to establish positive national spending priorities. Bowing to political expediency, it has allowed its attention to drift from our most pressing human and urban needs. Congress cannot allow this drift to continue. What we have outlined here is a new set of priorities which reflect the impact of a major domestic crisis on a war-strained economy.

The Republican "Human Renewal Fund" would allocate \$2.5 billion additional to governmental incentive programs in the categories of jobs, education, housing, pollution control, crime, rural revitalization, and the District of Columbia.

As a member of the House Education and Labor Committee I have repeatedly expressed special interest in Federal programs to encourage homeownership for the poor. Any attempt to meet the problems of our cities and their residents must include a workable program to provide safe, sanitary, and decent housing for those without a suitable home. This has been a national policy objective since the Housing Act of 1949. But, unfortunately, progress toward implementation has been limited to Government-owned housing, with totally inadequate results.

The act of 1949 authorized and appropriated funds for the production of 135,000 public housing units per year over a 6-year period for a total of 810,000 units. Twenty years later, we are still far short of accomplishing that total.

The gap between promise and performance is growing. Congress, in the Housing Act of 1965, authorized and appropriated money for the construction of 60,000 low-income units per year with a projected total of 240,000 units for fiscal

years 1966 through 1969. In 1967, the program was running at a rate of only 35,000 per year.

The President, in his message on the "Crisis of the Cities," has called for a program for fiscal 1969 that would produce 300,000 units at a cost of \$1.4 billion. The "Human Renewal Fund" that we have proposed would add an additional \$250 million to that figure. If the President's figures are correct, the increase should result in an additional 25,000 units in 1969. More importantly, our program, by using incentives through the free enterprise system will result in homeownership and self-respect rather than rentals and dependency.

Of the seven programs outlined by the President, three clearly reflect Republican ideas. We urge that these practical approaches, which the President himself figures to produce half of the projected 300,000 new units, be fully funded. I am speaking, for instance, of the plan to enable low-income families to buy modest homes financed and built by the private sector. This is modeled on the Percy-Widnall housing bill, which I cosponsored last year, and is expected to produce some 85,000 new units. Another example is the program to involve private business in rehabilitation of 15,000 existing housing units in fiscal year 1969. This idea was originated by Congressman WILLIAM WIDNALL. A third proposal would make 75,000 units available through the public low-rent housing program, a substantial portion of which will be provided by the Republican rent certificates program.

While there is no quick and easy means of providing good housing for the disadvantaged, this measure would be a responsible step in the right direction. Too much has been said and too little done in the field of Federal housing programs.

We would provide additional funds for an expanded approach which incorporates the tested principles of self-help and the commitment of the vast energies and productiveness of the private sector. By bringing these important factors to bear, we are hopeful that the challenge of housing the Nation's poor can be met and overcome.

More Trade With the Communists

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1968

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, as fast as we destroy our time-honored loyalties with our staunch free world allies, we build bridges to Communist countries begging for trade with the enemy.

Why should Russia and her Quisling puppets like Poland and Yugoslavia stop aiding in killing American boys in Vietnam and Korea? Seems like the more of our boys they kill, the more favored treatment our leaders want to give them.

I include a recent news clipping from the U.N. Conference on Trade and Development in New Delhi from the March 1 edition of the Washington Pravda following my comments:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 1, 1968]

TRADE WITH REDS

NEW DELHI.—A State Department official said the United States is planning legislation to expand its trade with Communist countries.

John W. McDonald told a committee of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development that America now has most-favored-nation agreements with Poland and Yugoslavia and that President Johnson is seeking legislation to enable him to extend such agreements to other East European nations.

VFW Voice of Democracy Contest

HON. DAVE MARTIN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1968

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, the Veterans of Foreign Wars annually conduct a Voice of Democracy contest. Over 400,000 students throughout the country participate in this contest. The VFW awards five scholarships to the top five contests winners.

James M. DeCamp, of Neligh, Nebr., which is located in the Third Congressional District was the Nebraska winner. I am very much impressed by his speech which I list below for the benefit of the House:

VFW VOICE OF DEMOCRACY CONTEST

Where will you find me? What do I look like? I'll tell you.

I have the strength and beauty of youth and the wisdom and experience of age. I'm anywhere and everywhere in this great land of ours. I'm there when you walk into church on Sunday and hear the entire congregation sing, "A Mighty Fortress Is Our God." And I'm there when your neighbor walks into his church and says, "Hall Mary, full of Grace." Yes, and I'm there when the little neighbor boy makes his Bar Mitzvah in the synagogue down the street.

My Name is Democracy, American Democracy to be exact. And I speak for myself—I speak for democracy.

I was born out of an impossible dream a group of English rebels had nearly two hundred years ago. They didn't know enough to give up against overwhelming odds when the British armies tried to crush them. And I guess I haven't known enough to give up either.

There have been times when my life was in grave danger. Times when I was ashamed. Like when my sons clad in blue and grey fought a savage civil war to test whether I might be allowed to live or not.

Nearly one hundred years later I watched in sorrow as thousands of sandy haired sons fell and spilled their blood on a beach called—Normandy.

Yes, and I watched with a heart bursting pride when a dying 20-year-old lad on a Pacific Isle called Iwo Jima raised his head to tell his commander—who happened to be his own father—"I'm feeling pretty good, Sir. Tell Mother I love her and make her understand it was worth it." And then he died.

His Mother and tens of millions of other American women understood why it was worth it. They understood enough to volunteer for the Army, Navy and the Air Force—to become nurses, jeep drivers and teachers. They understood enough to work at ammunition factories, airplane factories and as civilian volunteers at service clubs.

You know, I get disturbed sometimes with the way some of my people treat me. I've

given my people just about everything they could possibly want. They have more freedom, more opportunity, more wealth in this land of America than anywhere else on this God's green earth. And sometimes, it becomes necessary to defend this freedom, this opportunity, this luxury we enjoy. Yet these very people who partake most fully of all these freedoms, are so often the very ones who are the first to refuse to defend this freedom. Some burn their draft cards. Some openly help the enemy. And far, far too many are helping those who would destroy me simply by doing nothing.

Today I need my sons to defend me in a land called Viet Nam. Most of them are doing it. And a lot of them have fallen forever in the nameless rice paddies of Viet Nam. I'm proud of them for it.

Yes, I've had a rich and a full life. And I speak for myself, I speak for democracy.

And speaking, I ask you my people, to let me live. That's right, I, Democracy, am begging you, my people, for my very life, for without you I am nothing. I am nothing more than the people who share me. But with you guiding me, and being guided by me—with you protecting me and being protected by me—with your cherishing me and being cherished by me, I am the most powerful force for peace and freedom ever unleashed in this world. I can give dignity to men and hope to the oppressed. I can change lands of famine to lands of plenty. I can make the impossible dreams of the world possible. I can lead men to beat the unbeatable foe. I can lead men to reach the unreachable stars.

But will you, my people, let me live? Will you protect me? Will you defend me? Will you continue to give me life? I have the answer to that question. I have it and I will give it to you. The answer—is—what you make it!

The Nurse Training Act of 1964

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1968

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, all of us in the Congress take pride in the series of laws enacted during the past few years to alleviate this country's severe shortage of health manpower.

The Nurse Training Act of 1964 is one of these landmark acts. Under this act, 73 schools of nursing have been assisted with the construction of teaching facilities. These will provide about 9,000 more places—including 2,900 new first-year places—and improve 12,000 places in schools which were in poor physical condition.

In his health message, President Johnson has requested the extension and improvement of the assistance now provided to nursing schools and students under the act.

If we are to succeed in relieving the nurse shortage and in meeting the needs of our growing population—if we are to assure all of our people adequate nursing care—the assistance to schools and students of nursing provided under this act must continue.

President Johnson's proposal is directed toward this end. It extends the program of Federal grants to aid the construction of teaching facilities in schools of nursing. It assures the schools the financial support they must have to keep

pace with modern nursing practice while accommodating larger enrollments. It supports their efforts not only to improve curriculums but also to develop new programs or needed modifications in existing programs of nursing education. And it offers significant incentives to help recruit nursing students.

Together, these programs—some of them broadened from the original act—constitute a powerful attack upon the nurse shortage. I am confident that the Congress will act swiftly to assure their continuance.

Thoughtful Citizens Help Save Tax Dollars

HON. JOHN N. ERLBORN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1968

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Speaker, the cooperative efforts of the U.S. Weather Bureau and thoughtful citizens around the country is resulting in a savings to taxpayers of \$180,000 per year. To effect this saving, the Weather Bureau maintains a small facility, the National Reconditioning Center, in Joliet, Ill.

This is in the 14th Congressional District of Illinois, which I am proud to represent.

The Weather Bureau issued an announcement about this this morning, and with permission I insert the announcement in the RECORD:

THOUGHTFUL CITIZENS SAVE TAXPAYERS \$180,000 EACH YEAR

Note to Americans: If you find a radiosonde—that balloon-borne package of weather instruments that flashes back information to weathermen around the world—please return it.

Such thoughtful acts by citizens today are already saving the American taxpayer about \$180,000 a year over the cost of buying new instruments of this type, the Department of Commerce's Environmental Science Services Administration, reported today.

A small Weather Bureau facility in Joliet, Illinois called the National Reconditioning Center, recently repaired its 400,000th radiosonde since the facility was established in 1945.

Radiosondes, which measure temperature, humidity, and air pressure as they rise through the atmosphere and radio this information back to the ground, are launched from stations around the world more than 300 times each day. Most of them are lost in remote or uninhabited areas or in the sea when their balloons burst and they parachute back to earth. But about 25 percent of them are found and returned to the Weather Bureau where they are reconditioned for use again. (One record-making radiosonde was flown, recovered, and reconditioned seven times.)

Printed on the side of each radiosonde is a legend asking the finder to deliver the instrument (in a postage-paid mailing sack which is provided) to the nearest post office or mailman for return to the National Reconditioning Center. The instrument package also contains a brochure explaining the use of the radiosonde and urging the finder to return it to the Weather Bureau for possible reconditioning. Return of even the more badly weatherbeaten or damaged ones can be of value as parts can be salvaged for use in other instruments.

A new radiosonde costs from \$15 to \$30. The

average cost of reconditioning one is \$6.37 which includes parts, labor, and even overhead expenses at the Joliet center.

The radiosonde section at the center employs only 15 people who have set their goal at 125 reconditioned instruments a day.

The National Reconditioning Center repairs other weather instruments, too. One section, staffed by only three men, handles the reconditioning and calibration of 123 different instruments and components ranging in complexity from relatively simple anemometers to radar systems. In one year these men have saved the Weather Bureau up to \$250,000 by repairing defective or damaged equipment.

The center is headed by Glenn M. Miller, who has been in charge of the facility since it opened.

Human Renewal Fund for Fiscal Year 1969

HON. WILLIAM O. COWGER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1968

Mr. COWGER. Mr. Speaker, I have joined with seven of my colleagues in making an intensive study of the 1969 Federal budget. We urge immediate creation of a \$2.5-billion human renewal fund for fiscal year 1969 to meet urgent human needs and the urban crisis in our Nation. Creation of the fund would be coupled with a \$6.5-billion cutback in Federal expenditures in line with necessary wartime priorities.

By firmly cutting \$6.5 billion from the President's budget, we can responsibly plow back \$2.5 billion into urgent human needs.

This administration has consistently refused to exercise the political integrity required to establish positive national spending priorities. Bowing to political pressures of the moment, it has allowed its attention to drift from our most pressing human and urban needs. Congress cannot allow this drift to continue. We propose a new set of priorities—one which recognizes the enormous financial and economic difficulties facing us, but one which also recognizes the terrible human waste which is resulting from past and current inattention.

Five hundred million dollars would be allocated to mobilize private industry to provide meaningful jobs and training for the hard-core unemployed and underemployed. To provide jobs with dignity, we urge immediate enactment of the Republican Human Investment Act and full funding of realistic manpower training programs. The Riot Commission recently endorsed this Republican initiative that we have urged for years. Our proposal also doubles the money for vocational education and technical training.

Upon the same assumptions used in the President's budget, an additional \$250 million of expenditures for housing in fiscal year 1969 would expand the successful Republican rent certificates program, fully fund the Percy-Widnall approach to stimulate private enterprise construction, and expand the low-income construction and rehabilitation incentive programs to produce an estimated total of 325,000 housing units.

We would allocate \$250 million more

for air and water pollution control, and would double the money available to cope with the causes, prevention, and control of crime.

The rural problem of today is the urban problem of tomorrow. \$100 million would be provided for a model tax-credit approach to induce industry to expand in rural areas. Rural revitalization and growth must go hand in hand with programs to meet the human needs of the cities.

It is long overdue for the Federal Government to demonstrate in its own front yard how to cope with pressing urban problems. The District of Columbia, as our Nation's Capital, is of concern to all the people of the country. We propose an additional \$50 million Federal expenditure so that Washington, D.C., can become a model for the Nation's cities.

We propose deferrals totaling more than \$6.5 billion in public works, public buildings, nonmilitary research, highway beautification, supersonic transport and other low priority programs such as Government public relations. A limitation of agriculture subsidies to a maximum of \$10,000 per farmer is long overdue. Until the foreign aid program is reorganized, we propose no increase above present levels of expenditure. Congress itself must economize by deferring major construction and new facilities on Capitol Hill.

A cutback of military personnel in Europe of about 200,000 leaves an ample force to maintain our treaty commitments in Europe. The President's request for 45,000 additional civilian personnel should be denied. We propose an average 3-percent reduction in civilian Government employment, well below the normal annual attrition rate, so that no employees would lose their jobs involuntarily. Federal civilian employment has increased by 561,000 in the past 7 years.

These programs total \$1.5 billion leaving an additional \$1 billion to spend in other critical areas. Our proposal has been referred to the Republican Urban Affairs Task Force, of which I am chairman, to seek the advice of America's foremost urban experts. Five Congressmen who make up this special study group are also members of the task force which will conduct extensive hearings to determine the true priorities.

Federal tax money alone will not solve these domestic problems. We must avoid promising any of our people an instant tomorrow that is impossible of attainment. It is imperative that we put first things first. While we are spending \$30 billion a year on Vietnam, desirable but low priority programs must be deferred. Only tough priorities will meet long neglected critical needs of our people.

Immediate budget deferrals

1. 60% reduction of military personnel in Europe...	\$2,080,000,000
2. Supersonic transport (except R. & D.)	222,000,000
3. Defense supported arms sales abroad	200,000,000
4. Civilian space program	400,000,000
5. Highway beautification	85,000,000
6. Longworth House Office Building renovation	6,058,000
7. Madison Library	2,500,000
8. Government Printing Office Building	2,500,000

Immediate budget deferrals—Continued

9. USDA, \$10,000 maximum subsidy limit per farm	\$410,000,000
10. Freeze on moderate- to high-income apartment programs	400,000,000
11. Foreign aid	700,000,000
12. Forest roads construction (50% new)	45,790,000
13. Arts and Humanities Foundation	9,800,000
14. Public buildings (cite acquisition and planning)	5,497,000
15. Public information	100,000,000
16. Post office buildings (50% unobligated NOA)	26,121,000
17. Freeze on Government civilian employment at 97%	961,000,000
18. National Science Foundation	250,000,000
19. Forest highways (50% new construction)	15,000,000
20. Earth description and mapping (50% NOA)	6,750,000
21. President's contingency reserve (1968 level)	400,000,000
22. Public works (20% stretchout)	200,000,000
23. Appalachia (1968 level)	86,900,000
Total	6,614,916,500

Program allocations [Amounts in millions]

	Amounts
1. Jobs (human investment, \$300; Job Opportunity Board, \$25; EEOC, \$2; MDTA, \$103; Industry Youth Corps, \$70)	\$500
2. Education (vocational education and technical education for the future)	250
3. Housing (rent certificates, \$50; low-income construction incentive program (revolving), \$100; rehabilitation incentive (revolving), \$100)	250
4. Pollution (air and water pollution control)	250
5. Crime (causes, prevention, and control)	100
6. Rural revitalization (rural growth, tax credit)	100
7. District of Columbia	50

¹ Including Percy-Widnall program.

Introduction of Bill for Commemorative "Barefoot Mailman Stamp"

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1968

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill which would provide for the issuance of a commemorative stamp by the U.S. Post Office in honor of the barefoot mailmen of Florida.

Unique in the annals of American history and folklore, these mailmen provided the only mail service between Miami, and the Palm Beaches during the 1880's and early 1890's.

The mailmen walked 3 days each way, the 66 miles between these points along the ocean beach because that was the best route at that time.

They took off their shoes because the best footing was on the hardest part of the beach where the surf washed. At times, the wind and surf made the going

treacherous, and in 1887 one carrier, James Hamilton, lost his life carrying the mail when he had to swim an inlet and drowned.

The date of the proposed stamp, 1969, will mark the 75th anniversary of the end of this unique and memorable mail service, and I believe that by the issuance of a commemorative stamp bearing a figure of the barefoot mailman is a fine manner in which to remember these courageous carriers.

The dedication to service exhibited by these barefoot carriers has been the subject of much interest and enthusiasm by residents of the area once served. In 1943, a novel entitled "The Barefoot Mailman," written by Mr. Theodore Pratt of Delray Beach, Fla., was published. Moreover, Mr. William Schmalz and Mrs. Kendall Keeley, also of Delray Beach, are only two of a number of philatelists interested in furthering such a barefoot mailman stamp.

The interest in this stamp is great and I respectfully urge the Commemorative Stamp Advisory Committee of the Postmaster General to act favorably on this proposal.

Biography of Congressman Chet Holifield

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1968

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, for more than 20 years I have had the pleasure to serve in the House with the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD]. During those years I have at all times found him to be fair in his dealings with his colleagues, forceful and well-prepared in debate, and diligent in meeting his committee responsibilities. It is apparent as well that his efforts here have been approved by the people of his 19th Congressional District in California.

Because of his moderate but progressive approach to issues, Congressman HOLIFIELD holds the respect of his colleagues on both sides of the aisle. He is a man of principle and commitment, and his commitments are as good as his word. He has also refused to "soapbox" issues of fleeting but popular appeal, preferring to work in areas of less glamor but much greater importance to the Nation. His contribution in the field of nuclear energy will come to be recognized, in my opinion, as "statesmanlike" in the classic sense of the word.

Recently Congressman HOLIFIELD was honored by a group of friends from Los Angeles and Washington upon the completion of 25 years' service in the House. After the retirement this year of our esteemed colleague, CECIL KING, Congressman HOLIFIELD will become the dean of the California congressional delegation. This prestigious position has been held by only a handful of men over the years. It is a tribute to a man who has worked hard and long for California and the Nation. These few men like the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] who have made the House the great institution that it is, have made singular contributions to the Nation through their

tenure and committee positions. I think it would be fitting at this point in the RECORD to insert a summary of Congressman HOLIFIELD's distinguished public record:

BIOGRAPHY OF CONGRESSMAN CHET HOLIFIELD, 90TH CONGRESS, 1967-68

Congressman Chet Holifield of Montebello, California, was elected to the 78th Congress in November 1942 to represent the newly formed 19th Congressional District of California and has served his constituency continuously since then, having been re-elected each time by an overwhelming majority of the votes cast. He has had 13 consecutive terms in Congress and therefore is in the ninth seniority group in rank. Congressman Holifield's work for his constituents has won approval and commendations from substantial organizations such as the Los Angeles County Supervisors, City Councils, the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, Civic and Business Organizations, Labor Unions, Government Employees and Veterans Groups.

Congressman Holifield serves as Chairman or Vice-Chairman of the important Joint Committee on Atomic Energy during alternate Congressional terms. He is the ranking member of the Committee on Government Operations and serves as Chairman of the Military Operations Subcommittee. The Congressman has also served on various other Committees, i.e., Foreign Affairs, Post Office and Civil Service, and Military Affairs (now the Armed Services Committee).

COMMITTEE WORK IN CONGRESS

As a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy since its inception (in 1946), Congressman Holifield has been outstandingly active in the field of atomic energy legislation, serving as the Chairman of the Legislative Subcommittee. Also, as Chairman of the Special Subcommittee on Radiation during the 85th Congress, he held extensive hearings on the "Nature of Radioactive Fallout and Its Effects on Man." These hearings and the resulting Analysis received the universal approval of scientists, educational leaders and others.

In June of 1959, Mr. Holifield's Radiation Subcommittee held public hearings on the possible effects of a full-scale nuclear war on man and his environment. The testimony revealed for the first time specific estimates of damage from blast, heat and radiation (based on a hypothetical war pattern). In 1967, the Congressman conducted hearings and issued a report by the Joint Committee on the development and testing of nuclear weapons by Communist China.

Congressman Holifield always has been an exponent of civilian rather than military control of the atom. He is a constant and vigorous proponent of a strong atomic defense for the United States and its Allies and of a vigorous program of research to develop the peacetime uses of atomic energy. The Congressman also has insisted the benefits of atomic research and development be safeguarded for the use of the private citizens of the United States whose taxes have been invested so heavily in this huge enterprise.

In addition to his work on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Congressman Holifield is the ranking member of the House Committee on Government Operations (which has the power and responsibility of investigating all expenditures of the Federal Government) and is Chairman of one of its major subcommittees, Military Operations. During his service on the Government Operations Committee, he authored the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act (the Holifield Act) which established the General Services Administration.

In the 81st and 82nd Congresses, Mr. Holifield chaired the Subcommittee on Executive and Legislative Reorganization which proc-

essed 45 Presidential Reorganization Plans, 39 of which were passed by the Congress, resulting in the saving of millions of dollars.

During the 89th Congress, Congressman Holifield held hearings and managed a bill in 1965 which created the Cabinet-level Housing and Urban Development Department. In 1966 he authored a bill to create the Cabinet-level Department of Transportation, held hearings and managed the bill to successful passage. He therefore became the only Representative in our history to create legislatively two Cabinet-level Departments. In 1967, Congressman Holifield managed the President's Reorganization Plan for the District of Columbia, creating a mayor-council form of government, the first major reform of the national capital's governmental machinery in over 90 years.

As Chairman of the powerful Subcommittee on Military Operations, Congressman Holifield spent three weeks in January, 1968 inspecting American forces in Vietnam, Thailand, Korea and Okinawa. Congressman Holifield has consistently advocated a strong United States policy against Communist aggression in Southeast Asia.

HONORS

The California Congressional Recognition Plan, a privately endowed, nonprofit educational organization whose purpose is the improvement of public understanding of the records and services of the California Delegation in the United States Congress, has cited Congressman Holifield seven times as an outstanding member of the Delegation. The selection has been based on his public record, his official acts, as well as his integrity, ability, judgment, effectiveness, leadership, promotion of important public legislation and his service to his constituents.

The academic world has honored Congressman Holifield three times by awarding him honorary degrees: East Los Angeles College, Associate of Arts 1962; Lynchburg College, Doctor of Laws 1964; and Whittier College, Doctor of Laws 1966. In 1967, he received the coveted Congressional Distinguished Service Award of the American Political Science Association. This honor is given every other year to two Congressmen and two Senators, one of each party, for exceptional and outstanding public service.

On June 29, 1965, Congressman Holifield was presented with the Honorary Port Pilot Award by the City and Port of Long Beach, California. Previous honorees included the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, His Imperial Majesty Haile Selassie I, Emperor of Ethiopia and other notables. The award is not given annually, only when the City and Port of Long Beach believe it is merited.

Chairman Holifield is known as "a Congressman who does his homework" and because of his hard work, attention to detail and expert knowledge, he has been signally honored. He was elected to serve on President Truman's Special Evaluation Commission on the Atomic Bomb Tests at Bikini Atoll in 1946. He has served as Congressional Adviser to the United States Delegation at most of the International Conferences on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy in Geneva, Switzerland. He also has been chosen to represent the United States at several of the General Conferences of the International Atomic Energy Agency in Vienna, Austria, and Tokyo, Japan (1965), and has served as Adviser to the U.S. Delegation, First International Symposium on Water Desalination, Washington, D.C. (1965) and the Eighteen Nation Disarmament Conference, Geneva, Switzerland (1966, 1967, and 1968).

Mr. Holifield was appointed by the President to serve on the Second Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government (popularly known as the "Hoover Commission"). The Commission studied the organization and operation of the Federal Government and made proposals to eliminate duplication, waste and ineffi-

ciency which resulted in a further savings of many millions of dollars. For the past several years, Congressman Holifield, working with a bi-partisan group of Congressmen, has been making a study of the problems involved in reorganizing the rules and procedures of the United States Congress.

In addition to the other honors which have come to Mr. Holifield, he was the only Member of the House of Representatives (other than the Chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee) designated to represent the United States at the Dedication of the German peoples' memorial to General George Marshall at Bonn in October, 1963.

President Johnson requested Mr. Holifield to chair an ad hoc committee of Western Senators and Representatives to develop an agreement between privately owned and publicly owned electric utilities to utilize excess electricity from the Bonneville Power Administration in Washington State.

Approximately three million kilowatts of cheap electricity will be transmitted to cities in California and Arizona through an integrated transmission network as a result of achieving a successful agreement. The capital investment will be approximately \$700 million in the project.

Because of his extensive knowledge of the Federal Government and atomic energy, the Congressman has been a guest on such nationwide television programs as "Meet the Press," "The Today Show," "Face the Nation," etc. He has been the subject of many articles in national magazines: Saturday Review, Fortune, Saturday Evening Post, Reader's Digest, and Atlantic Monthly, among others.

WORK FOR HIS DISTRICT

Congressman Holifield's 26 years' service in the House of Representatives have earned him a position of high seniority and leadership in the California Delegation and the Congress. The honors and responsibilities which have come to Mr. Holifield have given him wide knowledge and experience and have earned him the respect and confidence of his colleagues, the other leaders of Congress and of the Executive Departments.

Because of his seniority and leadership ability, Mr. Holifield has been in an excellent position to guide legislation of importance to California and to the Nation through difficult debates on the Floor of the House of Representatives. During the 1st Session of the 90th Congress, he was instrumental in winning a major victory in the battle against air pollution. Through his skillful leadership, the House voted to permit California to improve its standards on auto emission controls, which are more stringent than the national minimum standard established in the 1967 Air Quality Act. Mr. Holifield "mapped the strategy" for the Floor fight on the California Amendment, and guided the California Delegation's actions on the Floor, managing to prevent watering down of the California Amendment.

The 19th Congressional District, which he is privileged to represent, has always been Mr. Holifield's foremost concern. In 1967, his efforts led the Department of Housing and Urban Development to approve a fund reservation of \$1.5 million in grant funds for the cities of Cerritos, Santa Fe Springs, Norwalk, Lakewood and Artesia, to expand the regional storm sewer and drainage system for the area. Approval of the measure came after months of intensive effort by Congressman Holifield, who stated that "this is a good example of the right kind of partnership between our Federal Government and local communities. It is in effect a return of Federal income taxes to the people of our District."

Congressman Holifield was one of the principal backers of legislation which led to the creation of the Bolsa Island Desalting Project, located about 1/2 mile off the coast of Southern California in the vicinity of Huntington Beach. Mr. Holifield joined Interior Secretary Udall in declaring that this

Project is the "first of a kind" in a number of respects. Among these are: the coupling of nuclear reactors for large-scale production of power and desalting water, the concept of locating a nuclear reactor on a man-made island, and the cooperative efforts of private and public power utilities, together with Federal and State agencies, in a large project involving new technology. It is estimated that the capital investment in this project will be between \$450 and \$500 million.

Mr. Holifield, as ranking Member of the California Delegation and Chairman of its Transportation Committee, was given principal credit by Secretary of Transportation Alan S. Boyd for winning approval of 90% federal participation in the estimated \$250 million Century Freeway Project in Los Angeles. This action means that California will receive assistance based on the interstate highway system formula of 90-10 federal-state cooperation, giving the State a return of an additional 40% of federal tax dollars over the conventional 50-50 sharing program.

Another important contribution to his district has been through the Congressman's efforts to secure unused and surplus government land for public parks and recreation areas. Several communities in the 19th Congressional District have generously dedicated "Holifield Parks" to the hard work of the Congressman.

In addition to the areas of public work outlined in preceding paragraphs, Congressman Holifield has assisted literally thousands of constituents in his District in securing help or adjustments on personal or business problems with the Federal Government. Immigration matters, military and veterans programs, and social security aid are all areas of concern to the Congressman, and numerous letters of appreciation from grateful residents indicate the importance of this kind of Congressional work.

Congressman Holifield was born in Kentucky, educated in the public schools of Arkansas, and has lived in Montebello, California, since 1920. He has been engaged in the retailing of men's clothing for over 40 years. He is a member of the Christian Church and various fraternal and civic organizations. "Chet" Holifield and his popular and attractive wife, "Cam," have four daughters and fifteen grandchildren.

Increased Federal Taxes

HON. SPEEDY O. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1968

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to protest, in the strongest possible terms, attempts by the administration and the Internal Revenue Service in particular to circumvent the Congress on the matter of increased Federal taxes. Typically, the present attempt is undertaken in the guise of tax reform. Briefly, the Internal Revenue Service proposes to end on March 15 the tax-exempt status of municipal and State industrial development bonds. And while the immediate income tax to be imposed by this drastic and sudden change in IRS regulations will be felt by those individuals who invest in such bonds, the final effect of the change will be to impose heavier taxes upon local property owners.

At a time when it is increasingly necessary for all levels of government to foster the economic well-being of our citizens, by creating jobs and by encouraging trade and commerce, the Federal

Government attempts to sabotage the efforts of the State and local governments in the area of economic development.

Mr. Speaker, a total of 43 States have programs of industrial development, which make use of revenue bonds. The efforts of these States to raise the economic status of their people will be severely dampened, if not completely ended. Industrial development bonds have been exempt since 1954, and it seems to me that at this late date the decision as to their tax-exempt status should properly be a matter for the Congress to decide.

Judge Exposes the Fallacies of the Reardon Report

HON. JOE D. WAGGONER, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1968

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, the so-called Reardon report of the American Bar Association's house of delegates, has been analyzed extensively since its appearance, but nowhere as clearly and concisely as by Caddo Parish District Judge John A. Dixon, Jr., in a recent speech in my congressional district.

The Shreveport Journal editorialized on Judge Dixon's comments and they are worthy of everyone's attention here in this body.

We need more judges on the bench like Judge Dixon and fewer like Mr. Reardon. Perhaps if there were more newspapers like the Journal which believe in responsible journalism, the issue would never have come up. I urge you to take a moment and read these views, which follow:

JUDGE DIXON TAKES THE PROPER STAND

It is to be hoped that large numbers of jurists throughout the country will follow the example set by Caddo Parish District Judge John A. Dixon Jr. in publicly opposing the American Bar Association House of Delegates' recommendations to restrict the release of crime news prior to trial. Judge Dixon, in his speech to the Sertoma Club of Shreveport, exposed the fallacies in the body of recommendations known as the Reardon Report.

From the sensationalism of certain criminal trials, the authors of the Reardon Report have assumed that the news media make a habit of abusing the freedom of the press and, in playing up information about crimes and defendants, interfere with the course of justice by prejudicing public opinion. The Bar Association recommendations would limit the police and attorneys in a criminal case to giving the news media only such details as the formal charge, a brief account of the arrest of the defendant, his name, age and family status.

Judge Dixon said he is not convinced there has been sufficient abuse of freedom of the press to justify such severe restrictions on news gathering activities and publication. As he pointed out, the restrictions would even prevent newspapers from printing information about the criminal records of persons arrested and charged with recent crimes. Thus, the public would be denied information that was a matter of public record.

If the press defied the restrictions and printed information not in a court record, even though the information was pertinent to public understanding of a criminal case,

the press would be guilty of contempt. The courts would acquire too much control over the dissemination of news.

Judge Dixon affirmed the importance of a free press in these words: "It's upon this free dissemination of news, the free dissemination of information to an informed electorate that all the other rights are dependent . . . We cannot have a free country, if we are not free to find out and if we are not free to know."

While there may be occasional excesses in the handling of crime news, the usual treatments of the crime cases is as objective as possible. Often the news media have contributed to the solving of crimes, disclosing facts unknown to law enforcement authorities. This right and privilege would be forfeited under the Bar Association recommendations.

Thoroughly objective reporting of a criminal trial, giving the background, of the case not only serves the public interest but it also affords the accused protection against possible unfairness in the legal proceedings. Public scrutiny through the news media is a wholesome safeguard for correct judicial procedure.

The Reardon Report flouts the principle of democratic government by suggesting that the recommendations be adopted by police and court jurisdictions, as if these bodies have the authority to exercise control and censorship over the press without even being so directed by state legislatures. These proposals would be more appropriate coming from a legal profession subservient to a dictatorial government.

But the American Bar Association membership includes independent thinkers of whom Judge Dixon is a fine example. It would be much to the credit of those independents to demand that their organization ditch the Reardon Report and acknowledge that a grave error of judgment has been made.

The Establishment of an Educational Opportunity Bank

HON. FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1968

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, the mounting costs of financing higher education constitutes one of the greatest domestic problems facing our Nation today.

As all of us are aware, the matter is not restricted only to those who contemplate higher education. It concerns all of us, for every American, by nature of his citizenship, has a vital interest in the educational status of our Nation.

Those of us who are privileged to serve in the Congress are especially cognizant of the fact that education is the very heart of a democracy and that the progress and well-being of our Nation is predicated upon the educational growth of our people.

It has, therefore, been a source of great pride to me to have served in the Congress when such great strides have been made by the Federal Government toward fostering the educational growth of our citizens by providing greatly needed assistance to the school districts, colleges, and universities across the land.

While some assistance has also been made available to students pursuing higher education, I believe that it has been inadequate in scope and amount.

I believe, in other words, that the problem is an overwhelming problem under existing legislation and that more suitable means must be provided to adequately cope with the rising costs of financing higher education.

Because the American society as a whole benefits from the educational progress of each and every one of its members, I strongly feel that the Congress must make a greater effort toward providing the means whereby more citizens may be afforded the opportunity to pursue a higher education.

For many years, the needs of our Nation were such that a high school education would suffice in taking one's place in the competitive market of our society. Thus, it was necessary to assure that all of our citizens were afforded the opportunity to attain a secondary education.

We all know that this is no longer so. The complexity, technological and scientific advancements known in our present times have made greater demands upon our citizens with respect to education. This, I might add, is the way it should be. Without the demand there would be no need, and without the need I fear that there would be precious little progress and growth.

Ergo, present demands compel us to reach beyond a secondary education. We must, in other words, presently make every effort to bring a college education within the grasp of every American.

I am very pleased to note that a proposal has been made that could provide the desired structure whereby every qualified American could attend the college of his choice regardless of his family's financial status. I am speaking, Mr. Speaker, of the educational opportunity bank proposed by the President's Panel on Educational Innovation.

Without interfering with present local, State, or Federal student assistance programs, this proposal would afford any student the opportunity to pay his own way to any college, university, or post-secondary institute to which he could gain admission. The educational opportunity bank would provide students with funds to cover the cost of their education against a pledge to repay out of future earnings. The bank, slated to be a separate Federal agency, would charge the students 1 percent of their gross income over 30 years for every \$3,000 borrowed.

As stated in the report by the President's Panel:

This might be considered not a "loan program" at all, but a device for enabling students to sell participation shares in their future incomes.

Let us consider some of the advantages to be reaped from such a proposal:

First. It would increase the number of postsecondary students from low-income families, and would relieve the burden of hard-pressed middle-income families who may have several children attending high-cost universities.

Second. The economically disadvantaged and middle-income students would be able to approach their choice of a college with options similar to those now reserved for the well to do.

Third. It would make the student responsible for his own education, and

would stimulate, I am sure, a more serious and mature approach to his studies. Under the present family-sponsored system, we tend to prolong adolescence.

Fourth. It would remove the heavy burden of working while in college to pay educational costs thus enabling the otherwise financially strapped student to devote full time to this studies.

Fifth. It would tend to make the higher education institutions more responsive to the needs of the students themselves who would, under this program, wield the buying power.

Sixth. The plan would enable both public and private institutions to improve the quality of education by charging tuition fees closer to the full cost of education.

Seventh. It is a voluntary plan that offers help only to those who want it.

Eighth. The student would not have to worry about a loan he could not pay for some unforeseen reason because his obligation to repay is related to his future income.

Ninth. The availability of loans would not be directly affected by the state of the money market.

Tenth. It would get the educational expenses paid without the hazards of direct Government interference.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the proposal for the establishment of an educational opportunity bank is worthy of great and expeditious consideration by the Congress. Therefore, I am introducing a resolution calling for a thorough study of the panel's proposal by the House Education and Labor Committee and the Banking and Currency Committee, of which I am privileged to be a member. These two committees should undertake a study of the proposal as soon as possible and, I hope, provide this House with effectual legislation to implement this plan in the very near future.

I urge that all my colleagues join me in support of this resolution for its substance is of great concern to all Americans and its fate may very well be that of our Nation.

Notice to House Members on Reprinting of 1968 Ukrainian Independence Day Program

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1968

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, with respect to the 50th anniversary of Ukrainian independence, a private order is being submitted for reprint publication of all statements and other insertions made by Members of the House of Representatives prior, during, and after the January 22, 1968, event, which was observed in the House on January 23, 1968.

If there is no objection from any such Member, his or her statement or insertion will be incorporated in the reprint brochure, which has been requested by the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America.

"G. Washington's Legacy" and the Editorial Excellence of James M. Flinchum

HON. WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON
OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1968

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, Wyoming is proud to count among her many notables in a State so relatively small the award-winning editor of the leading newspaper in our capital city.

Mr. James M. Flinchum came to Wyoming only 6 years ago to take over the editorship of the Wyoming State Tribune in Cheyenne. In the ensuing years he has made a reputation of trenchant and incisive editorials which lend an eloquent but hard-hitting interpretation to the affairs of State and Nation.

In 1965, Editor Flinchum won the Freedoms Foundation Award for an editorial on the Magna Carta and he has, in my judgment, again turned out a product of exceptional excellence, worthy of national recognition, in commenting on the time and travail of George Washington.

Mr. Flinchum's February 22 editorial, "G. Washington's Legacy" needs little from a lawmaker by way of introduction. It is a marvelous and timely comment that is as significant in today's debate on Vietnam as in historical relation to the America of George Washington's time.

Mr. Speaker, I include the editorial in the RECORD with my remarks:

G. WASHINGTON'S LEGACY: IN 1779? OR 1968?

"The rapid decay of our currency, the extinction of public spirit, the increasing rapacity of the times, the want of harmony in our councils, the declining zeal of the people, the discontents and distresses of the officers of the army, and I may add, the prevailing (sense of) security and insensibility to danger, are symptoms, in my eye, of a most alarming nature. If the enemy have it in their power to press us hard in this campaign, I know not what may be the consequence."

—George Washington, in a letter in 1779.

George Washington, a Virginia farmer, country gentleman, and community leader, is notable for one thing most Americans never think about. He commanded an army in behalf of this nation longer than any other individual has done so, in a major war.

Both the terms "army" and "major war" by comparison with modern application are courtesy terms only. But the Continental Army that planter, squire and amateur soldier Washington headed up was the only army the colonies had, and even though Washington's immediate field command was hard put at times to exceed the strength of one of today's infantry regiments, nevertheless it was the army. As for major war, while the Revolution took the form of a smattering of near-guerrilla skirmishes, it brought into being the United States of America and so it must by all standards of measure be accounted one of history's decisive military conflicts.

Washington was a militia officer and those who sneer today at reserve and National Guard soldiers might keep this well in mind. He was not a professional, but he was a highly intelligent, courageous, stubborn, determined, prescient individual who adapted his own native background hewed out of the 18th century frontier of America which then lay barely at the line of the Alleghenies, plus some practical experience in the field with

Braddock's unfortunate command, to produce a genius.

Washington believed in himself, in destiny and most of all in God; he did this literally and in the latter case, devotedly.

Washington seems to have been endowed with such an ability to foresee the future events taking shape in mid-decade of the 1770s that when he reported to the First Continental Congress as a delegate in 1775 he wore his Virginia militia colonel's uniform, the only man to do so although there were others who could claim some military background and commissions.

John Hancock, for example, wanted desperately to command the Continental Armies; but Hancock, he of the expansive signature, was out-thought by George Washington. It was Washington, 42 at the time, big, handsome, quiet and dignified, who made himself as conspicuous as a withdrawn individual could, in the halls at Philadelphia when the Congress convened and he showed up on the scene as a member from his home colony.

This was his first master stroke; but only the first of many, because after he was named to command the army Washington had to handle Congress—there was no President, no Defense Department, no nothing except the Congress as the directing force of the government—and the enemy plus his own grim internal problems with a raw, largely undisciplined and untrained army—all at one and the same time.

The fact he did this from June 1775 until October 1781, a period of six long years of trial, reverses, triumphs but all of its grim, unending struggle, of days when seemingly the whole fight for the new country aborning had been lost—that he never flagged, never gave any sign of yielding, drove his subordinates and stood as an example for the ranks when there was no other example, must surely be accorded one of the greatest personal triumphs against adversity in recorded history.

One thing about Washington must be kept firmly in mind. He fought as the situation demanded. Sometimes he had to retreat; on other occasions he utilized surprise and ingenuity as when he crossed the Delaware on Christmas eve, 1776, to surprise the enemy and capture a huge British force. Again he displayed the greatest courage and personal leadership in the field as at Monmouth when the Americans were on the verge of a great defeat and Gen. Charles Lee (no relation to Robert E.) was in the process of ordering a retreat. It is said this is the only time any one ever could recall hearing G. Washington curse. He stormed up on his big charger waving a saber, swearing like a first sergeant, rallied the frontline troops as the British poured shot and shell into their ranks and personally turned a defeat into victory.

Kind, soft-hearted and emotional despite his austere appearance, Washington at other times could be grimly exacting; as at the capture of young, handsome, gifted and likeable British Major John Andre, Howe's adjutant-general who worked out the details of Benedict Arnold's treachery and defection but who in the process was captured. Andre was so likeable that even his captors swore by him, but Washington was unyielding. War was war, Andre had violated the laws of war and he was subject to the death penalty; and the commander-in-chief saw that it was carried out almost immediately.

The amateur soldier Washington provided the prototype for an unending succession of future generations; he undoubtedly is the example for Robert Edward Lee, who, if he did not look like Washington altogether, certainly adopted the latter's personal mannerisms. Lee's father was one of Washington's chief cavalry leaders and the man who said, "First in war, first in peace, first etc."

Robert E. Lee's military genius, the fluid

movement of Washington's Continentals, the ability to take advantage of every opportunity especially of an opponent's weakness; the personal taciturnity, and above all the great example of overpowering moral authority and leadership: All of the Confederacy's great leader's qualities can instantly be seen as a derivative from Washington, the great example. In many ways Washington's qualities may have similarly inspired Thomas Jonathan (Stonewall) Jackson, another praying, silent, but exemplary individual who relied on movement, surprise and field opportunities.

George Washington, Virginia planter and country squire, not only was the father of his country but the father of the American army, and the root inspiration of countless military geniuses who came after him. His abiding philosophy was based on honor, duty, and devotion to God and country.

In our day of crass materialism, of indifference to country, and rejection of God by too many of today's Americans, we might reconsider on this 236th anniversary of his birth the example of the Father of Our Country and the legacy that he has left us.

Joe Martin Inspired the Late Clair Engle

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1968

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, this morning, as I was thumbing through my files, I came across a copy of a letter that the late Senator Clair Engle sent to Joe Martin in 1962, when we were honoring his 50 years of public service.

Clair's letter is full of warmth and feeling, and speaks eloquently of his admiration for Joe Martin. I was particularly touched by Clair's account of his own personal experiences with this great statesman.

I include the letter in the RECORD, along with other tributes today to Joe Martin:

U.S. SENATE,
September 18, 1962.

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: It is with great pleasure that I join in the tribute to you honoring your fifty years of continuous public service.

In this brief letter I cannot hope to make a fitting appraisal of the magnitude of your contributions to the nation. But I hope in some measure to put down on paper what it has meant to me to serve with you in the House of Representatives.

As I look back over my years in the House, I associate some of my most rewarding experiences with you. Your skill as a legislative strategist was an inspiration and education for me and all newcomers to the House. Never had I known you to run short of patience with the youthful pupils in your legislative school. Always you had time to listen and counsel. Somehow you managed to combine this gracious and kindly spirit with a ruggedness of character that won for you the lasting admiration and respect of your adversaries as well as your allies.

As Minority Leader and Speaker of the House of Representatives, your fairness and forbearance toward members of the opposition are classic examples of statesmanship. Some time ago the poet Robert Frost said

that he thought "people should be more patriotic than partisan." There is no better illustration of this philosophy than the memorable teamwork that you and Sam Rayburn maintained throughout the years as leaders in the House of Representatives.

It goes without saying that your qualities as a legislator have made better legislators of all of us who served with you. I only hope that your qualities as a human being have also made better men of us.

I wish you good health in the years ahead and continued fulfillment in the service of your country.

Sincerely yours,

/s/ CLAIR ENGLE,
U.S. Senator.

Introduction of the Vocational Rehabilitation Amendments of 1968

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1968

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill entitled "Vocational Rehabilitation Amendments of 1968." I would like to make a statement in connection with this legislative proposal.

The Vocational Rehabilitation Act is administered by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare through the Social and Rehabilitation Services. Initiated in 1920, it is among the oldest of the grant-in-aid programs of the Federal Government. It is designed to assist States in carrying out comprehensive programs for the rehabilitation of physically and mentally handicapped individuals. In addition, it provides Federal support for research and demonstration, training of personnel, and the construction, equipping, staffing, and improvement of rehabilitation facilities. The program is administered in most of the States by State boards of education and in a lesser number by independent agencies or as major components of other agencies. The rehabilitation of the blind may be administered separately from the general rehabilitation programs and are administered in a number of different settings.

The vocational rehabilitation program is, by general agreement, one of the most successful programs ever supported by the Federal Government. As it has gradually increased in size and effectiveness, it has come to make an important impact upon the economic and social life of the Nation. For instance, in the last fiscal year, more than 175,000 people were rehabilitated. The number is expected to increase to approximately 200,000 in the 1968 fiscal year. At the same time, the rehabilitation agencies have developed and practiced techniques which have been found to be most useful in working with all disadvantaged individuals, whether or not they have medically definable physical or mental disabilities.

One of my first subcommittee assignments when I came to Congress in 1959 was on the Special Education Subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor. During 1959 and 1960, hearings were conducted on special edu-

cation and vocational rehabilitation legislation, but it was not until 1965 that substantial vocational rehabilitation legislation was passed. It was my pleasure to be active in the development of the legislation that year, and the bill finally passed carried my name.

In 1967, I was chairman of the Select Education Subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor which considered the needs of handicapped individuals and developed a bill. The appropriation authority for the program of grants to the States was extended for 2 years; a national center for the deaf-blind was authorized; a new program for migratory workers was begun; the statewide planning authority was extended for a year; and residential requirements for provision of services eliminated.

At the time hearings were conducted in 1967, it was known that additional hearings would have to be held in 1968 to extend appropriation authority for research and training, innovations, and facility programs. I requested that consideration be given in the interim to any other improvements that were needed to increase the effectiveness of the program. The bill I have introduced today was developed as a result of this request. The bill was written by the staff of the House Select Subcommittee on Education with the assistance of the Legislative Counsel of the House of Representatives. It was developed after consultation with officials of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and voluntary organizations in the rehabilitation field.

Since a section-by-section analysis will be inserted in the RECORD, I shall confine my statement at this time to the purposes and principal programs contained in the bill.

APPROPRIATION AUTHORITY

The appropriation authority for grants to the States for vocational rehabilitation services is extended for 2 years, through 1972. The amount authorized is \$750 million for the 1971 fiscal year and \$850 million for the 1972 fiscal year. The appropriation authority for 1969 is \$500 million and \$600 million for 1970. Appropriation authority for section 3 of the act, innovations, is extended through 1972 with modest increases. Authority for research and training—section 4—is also extended through 1972, with authority increasing from \$95 million for fiscal 1970 to \$140 million for fiscal 1972. Appropriation authority for construction and establishment of rehabilitation facilities is also extended through 1972 with amounts running from \$35 million in fiscal 1969 to \$60 million in fiscal 1972. The section 12 rehabilitation facility program has been a very popular one, which has never been adequately funded.

Appropriation authority for workshop improvement, training services, and technical assistance is limited to \$14 million in 1969 and goes up by stages to \$24 million by 1971.

In all instances, an effort has been made to recommend sums which permit an orderly expansion of the program. The importance of this program and the contribution it makes to the economy of the Nation are such, however, that we

have not hesitated to recommend increases in appropriation authority of such nature that will enable the program to move as rapidly as circumstances will permit. The history of efficient and economical administration of this program at both Federal and State levels gives us confidence that all sums appropriated by the Congress will be wisely used.

DEFINITION OF REHABILITATION SERVICES

The heart of any legislation, of course, is the definition of the individuals to be served and the services which can be provided with the funds appropriated. In our judgment, the definition of the handicapped individual, as it relates to the provision of basic vocational rehabilitation services, is adequate for the present. We compliment the Rehabilitation Services Administration for the regulations that were developed pursuant to the 1965 legislation, which have permitted State vocational rehabilitation agencies to classify as "handicapped" individuals whose disabilities stem from other than physical or mental disability itself. We believe this was an important and progressive step, and we want to see maximum use made of this definition.

With respect to the definition of rehabilitation services, we think that several desirable changes are due, and the legislative proposal has included them. Outlined briefly, they are as follows:

First. The definition of rehabilitation services is rewritten and updated. In so doing, the definition has been simplified and also broadened to include (a) follow-up services to assist the handicapped individual to maintain employment; (b) family allowances during the period an individual is undergoing rehabilitation; (c) services which promise to contribute substantially to the rehabilitation of a group of individuals but which are not related directly to the rehabilitation plan of one individual; (d) services to families of handicapped individuals when such services will contribute substantially to the rehabilitation of the handicapped individual.

Second. The definition of rehabilitation facilities and workshops is also revised. As written in this bill, the term "rehabilitation facilities" is used to include rehabilitation centers, workshops, and other rehabilitation facilities operated for the primary purpose of assisting handicapped individuals and in providing evaluation and work adjustment services to other disadvantaged individuals. In redrafting these definitions, there is no important change in the type of facilities that can be supported under the legislation.

Third. Beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, the Federal share of the cost of the rehabilitation program will become 80 percent, instead of the present 75 percent. This change in the Federal share is recommended in order to make the Federal share of the vocational rehabilitation comparable to the Federal share of the work and training programs launched as a result of the Social Security Amendments of 1967. The Federal share of the cost of the manpower development and training and other manpower programs is 90 percent.

PLAN REQUIREMENTS

In this legislation, we also recommend certain changes in the requirements for State plans. These are as follows:

First. The "sole agency" required under present law to administer the State plan may be waived, when the State requests it and the Secretary approves it, to permit the State agency to share funding and administrative responsibility with another agency of the State in order to permit such agencies to carry out a joint program of services to handicapped individuals. It is felt that this will make it possible for vocational rehabilitation agencies to work more effectively with welfare, health, and manpower agencies in the State in carrying out programs for which they share responsibility.

Second. The vocational rehabilitation legislation has always required State plans to specify a minimum program of vocational rehabilitation in a State. The current definition of the minimum program has not been changed since 1943. In this bill, we have updated this plan requirement to make it more consistent with the minimum programs which have come to be accepted in the States. Incidentally, we feel that the fact that the Federal legislation has specified a minimum scope of services has had a great deal to do with assuring that vocational rehabilitation programs are comprehensive and attempt to serve all of the needs of handicapped individuals.

Third. For 3 years, Congress has been appropriating funds to assist in carrying on statewide studies of the needs of handicapped individuals. With the expiration of this specially funded program, we have inserted a provision which would require a State to carry on continuing statewide studies of the needs of handicapped individuals and how they can be most effectively met. This would be supported by Federal funds under the regular grant program.

Fourth. Currently, grants to the States may be used for expansion or alteration of rehabilitation facilities but cannot be used for new construction. This bill provides that when a State plan includes provision for the construction of rehabilitation facilities, it must specify that the Federal share of the cost of construction of such facilities for a fiscal year will not exceed 10 percent of the State's allotment for such year. It is also provided that the standards applicable to construction projects under section 12 will also be applicable to construction carried on under section 2. Currently, a great many States have allotments greater than they are able to use with the amount of State money made available to match the Federal funds. In many of these States, there is a tremendous need for new rehabilitation facility construction. We have every reason to believe that very constructive use will be made of this permissive feature. We do believe, however, that it is wise to establish a limit upon the percentage of section 2 funds used for this purpose, and we have suggested a 10-percent limitation.

VOCATIONAL EVALUATION AND WORK
ADJUSTMENT

This is probably the most important single proposal in this legislation. It would set up a separately financed pro-

gram of vocational evaluation and work adjustment with the Federal Government paying 90 percent of the cost within amounts authorized. The appropriations will be used to assist the States in establishing and carrying out evaluation and work adjustment programs for individuals who are classified as handicapped under the Vocational Rehabilitation Act and other individuals disadvantaged by reason of age, low educational attainment, ethnic and cultural factors, prison or delinquency records, or other conditions which constitute a barrier to employment. In the bill, we have very carefully defined evaluation and work adjustment services. Since work adjustment has not heretofore appeared as such in previous Federal legislation, we would like to say a few words about this definition.

By work adjustment, we mean services designed to appraise the individual's pattern of work behavior and ability to acquire occupational skills, and develop work attitudes, work habits, work tolerance, and social and behavioral patterns suitable for successful job performance, including the utilization of work, simulated or real, to assess and develop the individual's capacities to perform adequately in a work environment. It is generally recognized by authorities in this field that the disadvantaged person's attitude toward work and his work habits are likely to be more important barriers to successful employment than any other factors, include occupational skills. It is felt that evaluation and work adjustment has been a missing ingredient in most of the programs that have been developed in recent years in an effort to increase the employability of disadvantaged persons. The vocational rehabilitation agencies have had long and successful experience in providing this service to handicapped individuals. This has, undoubtedly, contributed to the fact that the rate of failure in the vocational rehabilitation program is substantially lower than is found in other programs with similar objectives. Also, it has undoubtedly contributed to the fact that the average cost of rehabilitating a person under the State-Federal rehabilitation program is substantially less than the cost of training and placement services in other programs.

In this legislation, we are suggesting that the vocational evaluation and work adjustment services be available, not only to the clients of the vocational rehabilitation agencies, but to the clients of other agencies who have responsibility in this field. It is our feeling that this is the most important contribution that vocational rehabilitation can make to the overall program of adjustment, training, and placement of disadvantaged individuals for which Congress has recently expressed such great concern. Although other agencies would not be required to avail themselves of the services provided, it is felt that they will be anxious to do so, recognizing that the use of such services will make their own efforts more efficient and effective.

In the legislation, we are also assigning to the vocational rehabilitation agencies responsibility of making appropriate referral of cases who come to them

for evaluation and work adjustment and for following up these referrals in an attempt to see that appropriate services are actually rendered. We believe that the approval of this provision by Congress and its adequate funding will be a most significant development in the entire field of services to people.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me say that I have received great satisfaction from the work I have done in attempting to improve the opportunities for handicapped and disadvantaged people. It has been my good fortune to be able to visit a number of rehabilitation facilities and become acquainted with many people who work in rehabilitation programs. It is an inspiration to see what handicapped people will do for themselves and for their country, when they are given a real opportunity to do so. It is also significant that people working in vocational rehabilitation are thoroughly client-centered. In many respects, they have been pioneers; they do not fear to try something new; their results have been outstanding, regardless of how one might measure them.

Mr. Speaker, it is my intention to conduct hearings on this legislative proposal as soon as practical. I know I shall receive the cooperation of Members of this House in an effort to assure that the legislation becomes effective this year.

Mr. Speaker, I include a section-by-section analysis of this bill following my remarks:

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF THE VOCATIONAL
REHABILITATION AMENDMENTS OF
1968

SECTION 1. Title. The Act is cited as the "Vocational Rehabilitation Amendments of 1968".

SEC. 2. *Authorization of Appropriations.* Appropriation Authorization for Section 2 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act (grants to states) is extended through 1972 with \$750 million authorized for 1971 and \$850 million for 1972. The appropriation authority for 1968 is \$400 million and for 1969 is \$500 million, and for 1970 is \$600 million.

Appropriation authority for Section 3 (Innovation) is extended with authorizations of \$11 million for 1969, \$13 million for 1970, \$15 million for 1971, and \$17 million for 1972.

Appropriation authority for Section 4 (Special Projects—Research and Training) is extended with \$95 million authorized for 1969, \$110 million for 1970, \$125 million for 1971, and \$140 million for 1972.

Another part of this section deletes an expired subsection which authorized grants for statewide planning.

SEC. 3. This section deletes obsolete language in Section 4 without changing its purpose or scope.

SEC. 4. *State plan requirements.* (Sec. 5.) This section includes four new plan requirements as follows:

(a) The "sole agency" required to administer the state plan may be waived, when the state requests it and the Secretary approves it, to permit the state agency to share funding and administrative responsibility with another agency of the state in order to permit such agencies to carry out a joint program to provide services to handicapped individuals.

(b) The state plan must provide a vocational rehabilitation program that includes evaluation of rehabilitation potential, counseling and guidance, personal and work adjustment, training, maintenance, physical restoration, and placement and follow-up services. This is an up-dating of the require-

ments for a minimum program to be supported by federal funds.

(c) The state plan must provide for continuing statewide studies of the needs of handicapped individuals, and how these may be most effectively met.

(d) When a state plan includes provision for the construction of rehabilitation facilities, it must specify that the federal share of the cost of construction of such facilities for a fiscal year will not exceed an amount equal to 10% of the state's allotments for such year and that the provisions of Subsection (b) (1) (2) and (4) of Section 12 will be applicable to such construction. The subsections referred to have to do with the use made of facilities constructed with such funds, the regulations of the Secretary designed to assure minimum standards for construction and equipment and safety, and wage rates in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act.

SEC. 5. *Definitions.* The definition of rehabilitation services is re-written and updated. The definition is broadened and simplified to include:

(a) *Follow-up services* to assist the handicapped individual to maintain his employment.

(b) *Family allowances* during the period an individual is undergoing rehabilitation in amounts limited by regulations of the Secretary.

(c) The provision of services which promise to contribute substantially to the rehabilitation of a group of individuals but which are not related directly to a rehabilitation plan of any one individual.

(d) *Services to families of handicapped individuals*, when such services will contribute substantially to the rehabilitation of such individuals.

(e) The Act now refers to rehabilitation facilities and workshops with a separate definition of each. These definitions have been revised to permit the use of the term "rehabilitation facilities" to cover rehabilitation centers, workshops, and other facilities operated for the primary purpose of assisting handicapped individuals and providing evaluation and work adjustment service for disadvantaged individuals. There is no change in the kinds of services which may be provided in rehabilitation facilities. All provisions of existing law which pertain to workshops or rehabilitation facilities will apply to all rehabilitation facilities under the Amendment.

(f) Beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, the federal share of the cost of the rehabilitation program will be 80%, instead of the present 75%.

(g) *Construction.* The term "construction" as it applies to facilities constructed under Section 2, is revised to include new buildings.

SEC. 6. *Rehabilitation Facilities.* Appropriations for rehabilitation facilities are authorized as follows: for fiscal 1969, \$35 million; for 1970, \$40 million; for 1971, \$50 million; and for 1972, \$60 million.

Other amendments to this section are technical and conforming.

SEC. 7. Section 13 is amended in three respects:

(a) The definition of rehabilitation facility improvement grants and technical services grants are combined into one section, without changing the purpose for such grants.

(b) The function of the National Policy and Performance Council, now limited to advising the Secretary with respect to training grants and workshop improvement grants under Section 13, is broadened to authorize such Council to make recommendations to the Secretary with respect to the improvement of all rehabilitation facilities and to perform such other services as the Secretary may request. Consistent with the broader function, the Council's name is changed to "National Rehabilitation Facilities Council."

(c) Appropriation authorizations are extended as follows: \$16 million for 1969, \$20 million for 1970, and \$24 million for 1971.

SEC. 8. *Vocational Evaluation and Work Adjustment.* The Vocational Rehabilitation Act is amended by inserting a new section entitled "Vocational Evaluation and Work Adjustment Programs." Evaluation and work adjustment are defined to include such services as:

(a) Preliminary diagnostic studies to determine that individuals are disadvantaged, have employment handicaps, and that services are needed.

(b) A thorough diagnostic study consisting of comprehensive evaluation of pertinent medical, psychological, vocational, educational, cultural, social and environmental factors which bear on the individual's handicap to employment and rehabilitation potential including an evaluation of the individual's personality, intelligence level, educational achievements, work experience, vocational aptitudes and interests, personal and social adjustment, employment opportunities and other pertinent data helpful in determining the nature and scope of services needed.

(c) Work adjustment services to appraise the individual's patterns of work behavior and ability to acquire occupational skills, and to develop work attitudes, work habits, work tolerance, and social and behavioral patterns suitable for successful job performance, including the utilization of work, simulated or real, to assess and to develop the individual's capacities to perform adequately in a work environment.

(d) Any other services which are determined (in accordance with the regulations of the Secretary) to be necessary for, and which are provided for the purpose of, ascertaining the nature of the handicap to employment and whether it may reasonably be expected that the individual can benefit from vocational rehabilitation services or other services available to disadvantaged individuals.

(e) Outreach, referral, and advocacy.

(f) The administration of these evaluation and workshop services.

Disadvantaged individuals to be served under this section are defined to include handicapped individuals as defined in Section 11(b) of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, and other individuals disadvantaged by reason of age, low educational attainment, ethnic or cultural factors, prison or delinquency records, or other conditions which constitute a barrier to employment, and members of their families, when the provision of rehabilitation services to family members is necessary for the rehabilitation of the disadvantaged individual. It is specified that the services may be made available to clients of other agencies.

Appropriations are authorized as follows: For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, \$50 million; for fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, \$75 million; and the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, \$100 million; and for each succeeding fiscal year such sums which may be appropriated as Congress may hereafter authorize by law.

The federal share of the cost of evaluation and work adjustment services will be 90%.

The "Pueblo": How Long?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1968

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, this is the 45th day the U.S.S. *Pueblo* and her crew have been in North Korean hands.

President Johnson's Message on Health

HON. FRED B. ROONEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1968

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, one of the most gratifying moments I have experienced as a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives occurred this week as I read President Johnson's message on health.

The object of my personal satisfaction was that portion of the President's message which dealt with the proposed Health Manpower Act of 1968. This is a subject in which I am keenly interested and one which is urgently in need of our prompt and sympathetic attention.

As a Member of this House when the Nurse Training Act of 1964 was under consideration, I found myself in strong support of that measure because it was both a well-intentioned and extremely necessary step to build our civilian nurse corps and overcome a serious national shortage of trained nurses.

While I remain today in strong support of the purposes of that piece of nursing education legislation enacted in 1964, I have come to recognize it has some serious faults. And because of those faults, we are not very much closer to filling the Nation's need for nurses today than we were 4 years ago.

To a substantial degree, the present demise of those schools of nursing which traditionally have supplied the great majority of America's bedside nurses—the hospital, or "diploma" schools of nursing—can be traced directly to some features of the Nurse Training Act of 1964.

I was pleased to see emerge in President Johnson's 1968 message on health greater recognition of the problems of diploma schools of nursing.

Because of soaring costs associated with good nursing education programs, many diploma schools have been unable to survive. Many more have been unable to plan to continue their nursing education programs very far into the future because growing annual deficits in these programs had been absorbed in hospital fees. In making available to these nursing programs the aid provided for in the 1964 act, we demanded greater proof of future growth and survival than most teaching hospitals could guarantee.

The result, all too often, was that diploma schools qualified for little or no financial assistance. More and more of these schools closed their doors. And in 1967, instead of recording an increase of enrollment over 1966 levels, America's nursing schools of all kinds recorded 2,000 fewer admissions because diploma school enrollments declined.

Last fall, I introduced a bill to establish an assistance program specifically designed to meet the needs of diploma schools and to halt further deterioration of our overall program of nursing education.

My bill stressed the need for increased attention to the special problems of diploma schools and called for institu-

tional grants to diploma schools to help bolster training resources and staff, a new approach to the method of accrediting nursing schools, and a greater role for responsible State agencies in the accrediting process.

These are among the steps now proposed in the Health Manpower Act of 1968. They are steps we in Congress need to endorse if we are to overcome the serious shortage of nurses which exists all across the Nation.

Recently, Mr. Speaker, I came across two reports which deal with the problems of diploma schools. One was an article published in a recent edition of *Look* magazine. The other was a study of H.R. 13096, the bill I introduced to aid diploma schools and which has some 50 cosponsors in this Chamber, prepared by a retired colonel, John P. Cox, of Arlington, Va., in conjunction with his graduate studies at American University.

I insert these in the RECORD at this point to emphasize the need for prompt and effective assistance to preserve diploma schools of nursing education:

[From *Look* magazine, Jan. 23, 1968]

WHERE DID ALL THE NURSES GO?

(By Roland H. Berg)

The Nation needs 150,000 more nurses but doesn't know where to find them.

The shortage, daily growing more acute, threatens the care of the sick. Although most hospitals have beds available, they remain empty for lack of nurses. Patients in need of operations or treatment are often turned away and forced to wait days and weeks for admission. For many, the delay complicates illness; for some, it is fatal.

Dr. Howard J. Brown, New York City's health-services administrator, says of the city-run hospitals, "The nursing shortage is an incredibly serious problem. . . . We're not giving first-rate nursing care in our hospitals; I'm not even sure we're giving second-rate service. But I am sure we have increased deaths in the hospitals because of the shortage." The situation is the same in many cities.

It's impossible to pinpoint a single cause for the shortage. Admittedly, nursing is hard work, demanding and, until recently, terribly underpaid. Even now, it pays less than other jobs requiring less skill, training or devotion. Many new, more attractive careers have been luring women away from the care of the sick. A generation ago, seven percent or more of girls finishing high school chose nursing as their career. Today, only four percent do so. . . . however . . . the causes are, one factor aggravates the problem. It is the running argument over where new nurses should be trained: in hospitals or colleges?

Traditionally, nurses have gone to hospital-based schools. There, after three years of basic science and nursing theory plus "learning by doing," a girl is awarded a diploma certifying her as an RN (registered nurse). And once she passes a licensing examination—required by most states—she is legally competent to care for the sick. For more than 95 years, hospital schools have graduated 80 percent of all nurses—skillful, dedicated women who have worked hard and long to give their patients TLC, tender, loving care.

The American Nurses' Association—the national society of RN's—recently labeled hospital training inferior and urged girls who want to be nurses to go to colleges instead for their education. Only nurses with college degrees, warns the Association, can fulfill the complex chores of nursing.

The campaign to low-grade hospital schools is succeeding. As enrollment dwindles and costs rise, many such schools are closing.

Since 1962, 100 or more have shut down; in another two years, 60 more will go. Today, 750 remain, but the goal is to close them all.

Unfortunately, not enough girls are entering college nursing programs to offset the loss. At a time when health authorities say the nation needs 20 percent more nurses to meet demands, each year there are fewer graduates.

In 1966, colleges granted degrees to 8,847 nurses, while hospital schools turned out 26,278. For the hospital schools, this was a decline of 2,000 in two years. And in those two years, colleges were able to make up only 1,800 of the drop, despite promotional campaigns that provided an added 106 college programs, while the number of hospital schools fell by 41.

College enrollment in nursing is not likely to soar. As a vocation for those who have the "call," nursing offers unique rewards and fulfillments. But as a profession demanding college education, it competes unsuccessfully with many other careers that promise bigger payoffs for the same cost in time, effort and money.

The drive to elevate nursing from a vocation to a profession was opened 20 years ago by a book, *Nursing for the Future*. It was the work of a Ph. D. in social anthropology. Esther Lucile Brown, who had written other books on the education of social workers, lawyers, physicians and engineers.

In 1948, Dr. Brown called the use of practical nurses a threat to the RN. Because of war-created demands during and after World War II, thousands of women with limited, hazardous training were taking over many bedside nursing chores performed solely by registered nurses. Dr. Brown's defense against the invasion was a revolutionary proposal: elevate RN's to professionals by making them get college degrees. "The preparation of the professional nurse," she wrote, "belongs squarely within the institutions of higher learning."

Her basic plan was to fracture nursing into a split-level. On the lower floor, she proposed to keep practical nurses, with a year or less of technical training to give patients bedside care; on the upper story, she put the professional nurse—an RN with a college degree—to supervise, administer and teach. With a college education, the professional nurse would no longer just carry out the doctor's orders; now, she would be his colleague, virtually an equal.

The American Nurses' Association liked the split-level plan and began to exert its influence to switch nurse training from hospitals to college campuses. But not until 17 years later did it issue its White Paper to justify its position.

A recurring theme in the Association's position paper is the decisive, independent role to be played by the professional nurse in patient care. As a justification for a nurse needing a college degree, the White Paper said she is now required " . . . to make critical, independent judgments about patients and their care." Physicians wonder whether this was an invitation to nurses to displace them as head of the patient's treatment team.

Physicians fear also that the position paper preaches a doctrine dangerous to patients with its claim that not only is the college-educated nurse the doctor's equal but perhaps in some ways, even his superior. Only once in the 13-page document, which discusses the role of the nurse in patient care, does the word physician appear. And it is this passage that worries medical men: "Recent direct leadership in nursing, aided by the focus on man's emotional well-being in what is called this age of affluence and anxiety, has enabled the nurse in significant measure to move apart from and farther than the physician in comprehension of and response to the patient as a psychological as well as a physical being."

Lurking somewhere in the murky language of that long sentence, doctors think, is the

notion that nurses with degrees can handle patient's emotional problems better than physicians can.

According to the White Paper, the RN with a college degree will be too busy with high-level decisions to give patients enemas, take temperatures, check blood pressures, give medication, change dressings or perform any of the skilled services that patients need and nurses traditionally provide. Those essential tasks, the White Paper proposes, shall be relegated to a less-educated person—the technical nurse.

In the new world of nursing envisioned by the American Nurses' Association, the hospital-based schools are not even good enough to train lower-level technical nurses. They, says the Association, should be educated in two-year junior or community colleges. By attending a junior college for two years, the ANA claims, a technical nurse can get a better general education plus more nursing theory than in any three-year hospital school of nursing.

The facts, however, raise doubts about the assumption. Typically, a two-year junior college curriculum in nursing provides some 1,500 hours of lectures. Included are history, English, psychology, sociology as well as science and nursing theory. In addition, the student visits a local hospital for about 45 hours to watch nursing procedures.

In the three-year hospital-school curriculum, a student also gets 1,500 hours of lectures, except that most of this time is devoted to basic science and nursing theory. Instead of just 45 hours of watching other nurses, the hospital-based student spends some 2,000 hours in wards, operating rooms and clinics, performing each kind of nursing duty under the watchful eyes of experienced nurses. "Learning by doing" for three years is how the hospital-school nurse acquires her skills.

And skill is what separates hospital-trained from college-educated nurses. Hospital directors complain that when they hire college-bred nurses—the four- or two-year variety—they must set up "experience courses" lasting several weeks before they dare to turn the new nurses loose on patients. Recently, a nursing director remarked about a newly hired college-trained nurse, "She could recite the details of eight varieties of enemas, but admitted she had never actually given a single one."

Opposition to the closing of hospital schools is rising sharply. While many knowledgeable observers applaud the ANA's desire to raise the status of nursing and to improve its educational standards, they cannot understand why it is necessary to destroy a source of supply that for 95 years has produced thousands of competent nurses.

The National League for Nursing, accrediting agency for all schools, which has supported the ANA's position, recently backed off slightly. Concerned not only by the lack of nurses but also by the growing rate of failures among graduates of junior-college nursing programs, the NLN now urges that hospital schools stay open until the colleges can turn out qualified graduates.

Not all health authorities agree with the ANA that a college-educated nurse is superior to the hospital RN either in managing the care of critically ill patients or in meeting their emotional needs.

One who disagrees is Dr. Douglas S. Damrosch of New York's Columbia-Presbyterian Medical Center. He says, "Measured against the products of the newer college and junior-college nursing programs, the hospital schools are overwhelmingly superior." He believes that nursing leaders who favor college degrees over hospital diplomas are showing " . . . blind and uncritical faith in a system that is replacing professional competence with a smattering of nursing skills, a smattering of liberal education and an academic degree."

The chief of surgery at Boston's Massa-

chusetts General Hospital, Dr. Paul Russell, points to the many RN's who are assisting in kidney transplants and heart-lung procedures. "These girls," he says, "highly experienced, are products of hospital schools of nursing. The lack of a college degree has not stopped them from becoming specialized in the most complex techniques we use."

At Houston's Methodist Hospital, which is associated with the Baylor University College of Medicine, nurses work in operating rooms and intensive-care units. Dr. Edward B. Diethrich shrugs off any claim of superiority: "Both college girls and hospital-trained girls take to this special work like ducks to water. There is no difference."

As for college-trained nurses understanding patients better than hospital RN's, one expert says, "Your ability to like people depends on your basic personality. Love and concern are God-given; they're not handed out with a college degree."

The nursing shortage will not be solved either by closing hospital schools or by blocking the modern trend toward higher education. Modern nursing needs both hospital schools and colleges.

A GIRL LEARNS THE ST. VINCENT WAY: SKILL AND COMPASSION

She's a bubbly 19-year-old from suburban Haddon Heights, N.J., has long dark hair that glistens and frames a heart-shaped face with deep-blue eyes. And she's enthusiastic about her choice of a career. In her second year of training at St. Vincent's Hospital School of Nursing in New York City, Joan Meakins says with determination, "I want more than ever to be a nurse."

Joan is one of nearly 400 student nurses taking three years' training at the school, which is part of St. Vincent's Hospital and Medical Center. This Greenwich Village landmark, with its more than 1,000 beds, is the nation's largest Roman Catholic hospital, and one of the oldest. For 75 years, St. Vincent's has been teaching girls like Joan the art and science of nursing. And through those years, more than 4,000 of its graduates have brought skilled, compassionate care to sick people around the world.

Even with dwindling applications—a cross that burdens all hospital schools—St. Vincent's still selects as students only those girls who can show top high school grades and a real desire to be a nurse. St. Vincent's directors proudly refuse to lower the standards that made it one of the first hospital schools to be certified by the Regents of the University of the State of New York and to be accredited by the National League for Nursing.

Joan doesn't need help to pay for her education. But at least half of her classmates do. Their living and tuition expenses, which average \$1,000 per year per student, are paid for out of scholarship funds. Fees and subsidies aside, the cost of training a nurse at St. Vincent's runs about \$4,000 a year. But the benefits far outweigh the immediate loss. St. Vincent's offers ideal facilities for training nurses. The hospital is dedicated not only to the care of the sick but also to community health, preventive medicine and research. When Joan gets her RN and passes her state-board exams, she'll be able to handle a job anywhere.

But that's still two years away, and Joan hasn't planned so far ahead. She may decide to specialize, and that will require post-graduate studies. Or she may want to broaden her general education and take some college courses in English literature or history—perhaps even try for a degree.

If Joan wants to work as a nurse as soon as she finishes at St. Vincent's, her starting salary will be about \$500 a month. That isn't much money. Fortunately for us, girls like Joan who go in for nursing are seeking rewards over and above the money they're

paid. Nurses can be certain of one thing: salaries may disappoint, but the rewards never do.

CONGRESSIONAL DECISION

(By John P. Cox, Arlington, Va.)

PROLOG

"A soldier of the Legion lay dying in Algiers—there was lack of women's nursing, there was dearth of women's tears." (Bingen on the Rhine, Caroline Elizabeth Sarah Norton, 1808-77.)

INTRODUCTION

In a democratic society that operates under a republican form of government, the primary purpose of such government is to do for the people, collectively, that which they cannot do for themselves. This concept, when applied to the constitutional government of the United States of America, is commonly referred to as providing for the general welfare and is found under the "general welfare" clause of the preamble of the United States Constitution. In seeking to implement this general welfare clause in a republican form of government, the representatives of the people rely on public opinion to support and guide their legislative efforts. These efforts are frequently influenced by small, well-organized, self-seeking, interest groups reporting to speak for a much larger segment of the American population, both within and outside of government. This continuum of self-interest both within and outside of government are organized to provide testimony and data that promote their own interest in a subject area that may frustrate national goals and objectives. When such testimony results in national legislation it frequently results in creating confusions in the legislative area rather than providing a meaningful vehicle for obtaining the national objective. An example of this frustration can be found in the "Nurse Training Act of 1964" (1) and currently proposed amendment as reflected in House of Representatives Bill, 13096 dated September 25, 1967 (2).

As stated in the Nurses Training Act of 1964, the purpose was "to amend the Health Service Act (42 U.S.C., Ch. 6A) to increase the opportunities for training professional nursing personnel . . .". While proposed amend. H.R. 13096 deals specifically with "increased assistance to hospital diploma schools of nursing." While both legislative purposes appear to be most desirable, the latter amendment appears to be in conflict with the stated purposes of the First Position Paper on Educational Preparation for Nurse Practitioners and Assistants to Nurses, as adopted by the Board of Directors of the American Nurses Association (ANA) in December 1965. This position paper was summarized by the chairman of the committee on Education at the 1966 Biennial Convention of ANA (3) when she stated, ". . . that all nursing education programs should be in institutions of learning within the general system of education. Two levels of nursing practice are defined and discussed with the education needed for each. The position paper says minimum preparation should be (an) associate degree education in nursing. Education for assistants in the health service occupations should be short intensive pre-service programs in vocational education institutions rather than on-the-job training programs."

It must be noted that nothing was contained in the position paper reported to the 1966 Biennial Convention of ANA on the position in the proposed educational structure of nursing education about the place or qualification category of the diploma school graduates, nor was a projected time schedule for implementation proposed. These two failures create a void in which the immediate and projected requirements of the nation's

nursing needs must be examined and into which H.R. 13096 projects itself.

NURSING INFRASTRUCTURE

A. Organizational structures

The most powerful lobby and nurses organization in the United States today is the American Nurses Association (ANA), whose Washington, D.C. representative is Miss Julia Thompson. This organization, much like the AFL-CIO, reputed to speak for all labor, reportedly speaks for the 640,000 registered nurses in the United States. Much like organized labor unions, the American Nurses Association's eighth article in their platform is to "assist nurses to improve their working conditions through strengthening economic security programs using group techniques such as collective bargaining." (4) This sounds more like a labor organization than a professional group. The American Nurses Association has a membership of 160,000 or 25 percent of the 640,000 registered nurses in the United States. From its New York office it seeks to control not only nursing practices but also the supply of registered nurses to meet the Nation's current and projected requirements through means of a system of national nurses training accrediting, and nurses State licensure examinations.

Since the American Nurses Association was founded in 1896, the association has laid claim to the national responsibilities of determining the scope of nursing practice and assuring the public that those who practice nursing are competent. A host of other organizations entered the national nursing field between 1896 and 1952, few of which have survived. In 1952, two of the remaining three nurses organizations, National Organization of Public Health Nurses (NOPHN) and the National League for Nursing Education merged to form the National League for Nurses (NLN). This latter organization, NLN, unlike ANA is not restricted to Registered Nurses and draws much of its support from the National organized academic community. The NLN has become for all intent and purposes the Educator/Administration arm of ANA and has been recognized by ANA as the National accrediting agency for all basic nursing education programs, including that of practical nurses. Practical Nurses have their own national organization, the National Federation of Licensed Practical Nurses. However, their licenses like that of all Registered Nurses are dependent upon NLN prepared examination administration by the individual states. In 1955, ANA created the American Nurses Foundation (ANF), "organized exclusively for charitable, scientific, literary and educational purposes." ANF receives much of its financial support through a system of grants for specific projects from the U.S. Public Health Service. ANF Board of Directors enclosed the following foundation objectives:

1. To conduct and promote scientific nursing research in patient care with full utilization of basic and applied disciplines and to provide consultation service in the interest of scientific nursing research.
2. To provide financial support for research including support for exploration of promising ideas.
3. To provide interdisciplinary research experience.
4. To disseminate and to promote the dissemination of research findings through publications, conferences and other communication media.
5. To conduct experimental investigation to discover methods of implementing research results.

In all the publications of ANA and ANF research, no specific effort appears to have been made to up-grade the diploma school nor has any long term research been undertaken to satisfy the Nation's Health Goals in nursing.

B. Control structure

The interlocking control of ANA-NLN, both through its licensing examination and accreditation techniques, affect all of the nations 1,219 schools of nursing, 797 of which are diploma schools. While NLN continues to act as the official voluntary accrediting body recognized by the U.S. Commissioner of Education, they are also recognized by ANA as the National Accrediting agency for all basic nursing educations. This unbelievable conflict of interest continues to be exercised by ANA-NLN, even in view of ANA-stated position that "education for those who work in nursing should take place in institutions of learning within the general system of education." (5) Although diploma schools have been closing at the rate of 12 per year, for the past decade, they nevertheless account for 85 percent of the nation's currently Registered Nurses. In 1966 alone, the 797 diploma schools graduated 26,278 nurses for an average of 33 nurses per school, while the combined 422 associate and baccalaureate degree programs accounts for only 8,847 nurses or 22 per school. Even with the decline in diploma schools, they account for 75 percent of the nurses entering the profession in 1966.

The present 640,000 Registered Nurses is 210,000 short of the nation's goal of 850,000 by 1970. In addition to the rapid rate of diploma schools closing for lack of financial support, there is also a continuing decline in diploma school attendance primarily created by the uncertainty of their graduate status in the hierarchy of nursing being established by ANA. The diploma school graduate while being an RN is not recognized as either a "technical nurse" or a "professional nurse," both terms being reserved for the associate and baccalaureate degree programs respectively. What is worse is that while NLN may accreditate the diploma school programs, ANA has made no provision for either the diploma school or the associate degree students to build on their past education towards a baccalaureate degree in nursing without loss of many years of education and training. Diploma schools provide from twenty-eight to thirty-six months of instruction or a total of 4480 to 5760 hours of either classroom or clinical instruction while the baccalaureate programs provide one hundred and twenty to one hundred and thirty credit hours of work or 1920 to 2400 hours of classroom instruction and clinical experience. It is obvious that there is a complete lack of educational structure by ANA-NLN, in that three separate programs with both the diploma and associate degree programs being terminal professional academic training. Only through the baccalaureate program may a nurse obtain recognized further education towards a higher academic degree without loss of credits. Another critical factor overlooked by ANA-NLN educational pattern is that the majority of nurses leave their profession within five years and remain absent for approximately fifteen years or during their childbearing years with only part-time or volunteer work being performed during this period.

It is normally the hospital diploma school, without financial aid from either the state or federal government, that must take up the burden of refresher training for those nurses returning to the field of active nursing. This refresher training, regardless of educational level, is essential to maintaining current staffing standards within the hospitals. A further consideration that appears to escape Congress is that the vast majority of diploma schools are located in the eastern half of the United States. There are ninety such diploma schools in the state of Pennsylvania alone. Many of these communities do not have community colleges or

universities and those that do cannot afford setting up associate or baccalaureate programs for such a small segment of their student body. In any event they, the colleges, need a hospital and a public health service that can provide the clinical training required for either the associate or baccalaureate degree. The long-term impact on the community health posture of those communities losing diploma nursing schools has not been studied or even estimated. The financial impact on prospective students has not been studied in detail nor tuitions compared with diploma schools, junior colleges or universities. It is known that the relatively low tuition of diploma school has been a major inducement for young high school graduates to continue their education.

The second control technique used by ANA-NLN is that of the states licensing process. The laws of each state provide for the appointment of a board of nursing which is a unit of state government. This board of nursing, or nursing examiners as they are frequently called, is charged with inspection of all the state schools of nursing, approving curriculum and administering licensing examinations. ANA recommends that the state boards be composed of professional nurses that meet specific qualification established by ANA. ANA has gone so far as to publish a list of board functions and an ANA manual for members of State Boards of Nursing. The ANA-approved basic responsibilities of boards of nursing are:

1. Establishment of minimum standards for programs in basic nursing, both professional and practical.
2. Visitation of schools and study of curriculum, faculty and facilities, as a prerequisite to the granting of official accreditation.
3. Development of licensing examinations to test the fitness of candidates in meeting minimum standards of safety to practice.
4. Administration of the examination and, on the basis of candidate achievement, determination of the granting or withholding of a license.
5. Arrangement for the periodic renewal of licenses.
6. Suspension or revocation of licenses for cause.
7. Maintenance of legal records.
8. Action on application for licensure from candidates from other states and other countries.
9. Collection, analysis and interpretation of data on education and licensure.
10. Stimulation for improvement in nursing and nursing education.

Candidates for licensure apply to the Board of Nursing in the particular state in which they wish to practice. If the applicant is approved by the Board of Nursing, the applicant is eligible to take the state licensing examination.

Since the purpose of the examination is to determine minimum competency for safe practice, the same examination is used for all graduates, although preparation may vary in diploma, associate degree and baccalaureate programs. The ANA committee of State Boards of Nursing appoints a committee on Blueprint for licensing Examiners, composed of six persons employed by the State Boards from different geographical regions of the United States. This committee develops a core test plan for each series of professional and practical nursing examination subject matter experts (item writers). They are recommended by all state boards on an alternating basis to prepare suitable items for the tests. Each item writer spends one week working with the NLN test construction staff to formulate questions in the area of her specialty.

The professional nursing examination includes five subjects: Medical, Surgical, Obstetrical, Pediatrics, and Psychiatric Nurs-

ing. Following a final review by the Blueprint Committee, the examination papers are printed in final form by the NLN. They are then distributed to the participating boards of nursing undersigned. The examination in practical nursing is developed in two parts according to a similar plan. Knowledge and judgment necessary to pass this examination are in keeping with the minimum standards for practical nursing. Two days are allowed for writing the examination in professional nursing and one day for the examination in practical nursing. The candidate's answer sheets are returned to the NLN for machine scoring and statistical reports are sent to each board of nursing.

The individual state board studies the results and determines the minimum passing score. As previously stated, the same five basic subject examinations are given to all graduates whether they be from diploma, associate or baccalaureate degree programs in order to become a Registered Nurse from their particular state. It would therefore appear that the subject matter and not the academic environment determines "minimum competency." Further, it would appear that the United States government, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW) in particular and the Surgeon General specifically, has permitted a professional organization by default to assume quasi-government if not total government control over a major segment of the Nation's Health Program.

TWO VIEWS

The crises in the nursing profession; recruitment, program accreditation, education practices and licensure are not confined to nurses alone. The medical profession has spoken out strongly against the position of the ANA-NLN as have the vast majority of the non-ANA members in the unofficial nursing publications such as the *R.N.* Two such views are expressed in recent publications.

A. Physicians speak

Philip Cooper M.D. in a recent editorial in *Medical Opinion and Review* had this to say:

"The ever-increasing shortage of nurses, compounded by the shifting of them from direct patient care of patients to supervisory positions, is creating serious problems. Patients are not only being deprived of the understanding, encouragement, and compassion nurses are able to offer, but are also being exposed to the hazards inevitably associated with inadequate care.

A major factor in the creation and perpetuation of the problem has been the attitude of nursing organizations such as the American Nursing Association. They recommend that all schools of nursing be university schools (university-based diploma schools) and that all hospital schools (hospital-based diploma schools) be abolished. This recommendation is vigorously opposed by the American College of Surgeons, by many hospital administrators, and, I believe by the majority of nurses.

The attitude of the nursing organizations is unrealistic; most nurses are still being educated in hospital schools, and graduates of these schools are well equipped to effectively undertake their nursing responsibilities. However, because the future of hospital schools is so unsure, they are now experiencing difficulty in recruiting students. And this difficulty places their actual existence in even more jeopardy. Students considering application hesitate, fearing that, as graduates of hospital schools, they will find it difficult to advance in position and salary unless they acquire an academic degree at a later date. This recruitment problem will continue as long as nursing educators or organizations remain determined to do away with these schools.

Some nursing educators recommend that all nurses obtain an associate's or bachelor's degree. Probably they believe that this would raise the prestige and stature of the nurse; it would make her a "professional." I assume this is from their preference for the term "professional nurse." They fail to realize, however, that the word "professional" adds little to a person's prestige today; it has been adopted by people in many fields requiring comparatively little education and by others simply on the basis that they are paid for their services. Indeed, there are still other activities, also referred to as "professions," whose dignity is open to serious question. I would recommend that nurses drop the term and refer to themselves simply as "nurses." The latter designation needs no embellishment; it will continue to command all the respect, admiration, and prestige that nurses seek and deserve.

Most nurses prefer bedside nursing. But no nurse can be properly trained without an adequate clinical exposure to patients. Hospital programs include such adequate experience, but university programs do not. In one associate degree program, for example, the student is offered only thirty hours of hospital work—practically all of it on an observation basis. This deficiency in training becomes immediately evident when the nurse assumes clinical responsibilities after graduation.

Nurses themselves object to the downgrading of clinical work in the schools, questioning the need for a university program as a prerequisite, and are unhappy when they are assigned supervisory and administrative responsibilities. Yet their views and protestations are ignored. They should be heard and allowed to have some say about planning and conducting their careers. The choice between a hospital or a university school should be left to the prospective student. Those who are interested in supervisory or administrative work, in specialized nursing, or in acquiring college credits or an academic degree could attend a university school by choice, or continue their education at a university following graduation from a hospital school.

By all means, hospital schools should be preserved; they should be generously subsidized by State and Federal funds, and students should receive stipends to avoid serious financial problems while in attendance. Moreover, all university programs should be required to emphasize clinical teaching—college courses included in the curriculum should supplement, never replace, good clinical experience. Students considering a university rather than a hospital program should be discouraged from doing so unless the over-all program includes sufficient clinical training.

Physicians must assume active roles in bringing about necessary changes. They must also share in insisting that the existence of hospital schools be assured and that additional ones be established as soon as possible. Physicians must also support the nurses and nursing organizations that consider bedside care to be the nurse's most important function.

Even so, the status and prestige of nurses will remain secure only if they adopt a realistic and effective approach to correcting the situation. The image of the nurse will be seriously tarnished if, as a result of downgrading the primary purpose of nursing, they are themselves directly responsible for a continuing serious shortage of nurses while the need for them increases."

B. ANA position paper

In November 1967 ANA issued an official position paper on H.R. 13096. This statement like all previous statements is "against" the diploma school and thus against these school graduates. ANA again fails to recognize any national goals on the availability of nurses or the structuring of nursing education to up-

grade the diploma schools. The ANA official position was stated in capital commentary as follows:

"A bill to amend the Nurse Training Act of 1964, H.R. 13096, was introduced by Representative Fred Rooney (D-Pa.) on September 25. This bill would provide for increased assistance to hospital diploma schools of nursing.

As stated in the bill, its purpose is to prevent further attrition and promote the development of public and nonprofit private diploma schools of nursing. Mr. Rooney's bill is co-sponsored by 24 other Representatives. A similar bill has been introduced in the Senate by Senator Lister Hill (D-Ala.). It is not likely that these bills will be considered by the Congress this year.

The bills include the following proposals:

1. Payments to each public and nonprofit diploma school of nursing for each fiscal year in a five year period beginning July 1, 1967, based on enrollment in a diploma school of nursing, as follows:

Under 50 students, \$12,000 annually; 51 to 100 students, \$15,000; 101 to 150 students, \$18,000; 151 to 200 students, \$21,000; and 201 up, \$24,000.

2. An annual grant, to each school, not to exceed \$6,000 on a 50-50 matching basis for library resources.

3. An annual grant, to each school, of \$400 per each full-time student.

In line with its position concerning nursing education, and consistent with previous statements, the American Nurses' Association has communicated with its state presidents and executive directors concerning the bills. The following information was included in the communication:

H.R. 13096 and S. 2549 provide that only diploma programs in nursing education will be assisted. The ANA feels strongly that the general support grants that these bills propose are also needed by nursing programs conducted in junior and senior colleges and universities.

Under the provisions of the Nurse Training Act of 1964, accredited baccalaureate, associate degree and diploma programs were all eligible to apply for construction grants and project grants for improvement in teaching and could participate in the student loan program.

Diploma programs only were eligible for funds, authorized at \$41 million over a five-year period, to help them under-write the cost of a nursing education program and to prevent attrition and promote their development.

Of significance is the fact that for the fiscal years 1964 through 1967 payments to diploma programs under this provision totaled \$5,997,150 although \$21 million was authorized under the Act. Either there was no demand or the majority of the programs could not meet the criterion of increased enrollment.

The availability of funds to diploma programs during these last three years has neither prevented attrition of diploma programs nor has it promoted their development. Between 1965-1966, there was a net decline of 24 diploma programs.

However, in 1966 there were 1,225 programs offered by 1,219 schools of nursing, an increase of 32 over the 1965 total. The overall growth in the establishment of programs is due largely to the rapid development of associate degree programs. Between 1965 and 1966 there was a net increase of 44 associate degree programs and 12 baccalaureate degree programs. Support of these programs now is important since the trend in enrollment is toward such programs. If these are the programs that are attracting students, then we believe federal funds should be increasingly channeled to them.

In H.R. 13096 and S. 2549 the only criterion for eligibility to receive funds is that the diploma school of nursing be ac-

credited by the appropriate state agency recognized by the Surgeon General. It is ANA's position that federal funds should go only to programs that are nationally accredited, or have assurance of accreditation, by a voluntary accrediting body recognized by the U.S. Commissioner of Education.

It should be noted that under H.R. 13096 and S. 2549 any program, regardless of quality, would be eligible for funds if it met minimal requirements set by state law. This is because all nursing education programs must be approved by a state agency in order to operate. However, requirements are minimal and quality is not guaranteed by such approval.

The ANA recognizes the National League for Nursing as the national accrediting agency for all basic nursing education programs. NLN accreditation is directed toward strengthening and maintaining quality of nursing education for the protection of both the student and the public. Therefore, the ANA is opposed to the allocation of federal funds to programs that are not nationally accredited.

Another proposal in H.R. 13096 is for the establishment and operation of a state comprehensive planning committee for nursing education on a 75%-25% federal-state matching basis. The committee would be appointed by the appropriate state officer—not identified in the bill—and would have equal representation from baccalaureate, associate degree and diploma schools of nursing. In Senator Hill's bill the public would also be represented on the committee. The committee would develop a master plan for nursing education in the state. The ANA supports the principle underlying this provision.

The Association has urged that careful planning should precede any action to transfer or to develop new or different programs. It believes educational, health and welfare authorities, professional and volunteer groups in the health field and community planning bodies must plan and work cooperatively with nursing to insure an adequate nursing supply. In many states such planning is already underway.

The American Nurses' Association also believes in the need for sound planning before existing nursing education programs are closed and new ones established.

CONCLUSIONS

The records and statistics cited would indicate that ANA-NLN, while reporting to speak for all Registered Nurses, has by their position on H.R. 13096 disfranchised the majority of the present and future diploma school graduate nurses they claim to represent. Furthermore, it would appear that ANA-NLN educational structuring efforts, that excluded the diploma school, are totally unsatisfactory and incompatible with National Health Goals in view of the current nursing shortage, the war in South East Asia and the nursing impact of Medicare and Medicaid. The efforts of ANA-NLN nursing-educators to dismantle the House of Nursing Education before an adequate and more widely dispersed new system has been fully established and tested, indicated a complete and total lack of understanding of the nature and national effects of their actions and professional competency. One can not help but feel that the real opposition to H.R. 13096 is not the diploma school or the competency of their graduates, for this would be an attack on the competency of the vast majority of Registered Nurses, but rather the statutory authority and direction by the U.S. Surgeon General to approve such diploma schools. This low keyed opposition of this part of H.R. 13096 would in effect take, once and for all, from ANA-NLN their presumed authority of the nation's accrediting body for Nursing Education. H.R. 13096 is a good bill, a needed bill that effectively deals with an urgent problem on the na-

tion's agenda. It is now in Committee and will come up for hearing during the Second Session of the 90th Congress.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Public Law 88-581, 88th Congress, H.R. 11241 September 4, 1964, "Nurse Training Act of 1964."
2. Proposed Amendment to Nurse Training Act of 1964 H.R. 13096, 1st Session, 90th Congress, September 1967.
3. American Journal of Nursing, ANA Convention Report Volume 66, No. 7 July 1966.
4. American Nurses' Association, Platform adopted Friday, June 17, 1966.
5. American Nurses' Association, Pamphlet, Examination for the State Licensure to practice Nursing.
6. Nursing Research Report, Volume 2, No. 4, December 1967.
7. R.N. Editorial "Needed a New Definition of Professional Nursing".
8. Health Insurance Statistics, U.S. Department of Health Education and Welfare, Current data from the Medicare Program, November 1967.

INTERVIEWS

1. Miss Julia Thompson RN, Washington Representative of American Nurses' Association.
2. Miss Annabelle Petterson RN, Washington Office of National League for Nursing.
3. Miss Alice Herski RN, Nursing Legislation, Health Education and Welfare.
4. Miss Jane Roberts RN, Nursing Recruitment, Health Education and Welfare.
5. Miss Corey Fillin RN, Nursing Examiner, Washington, D.C.
6. Miss Mary Hampton, Legislative Assistant to Congressman Joel Broyhill of Virginia.
7. Mr. Ray Huber, Legislative Assistant to Congressman Fred Rooney of Pennsylvania, Sponsor of H.R. 13096.

EPILOG

"Human history becomes more and more a race between education and catastrophe." (The Outline of History, Herbert George Wells, 1866-1946.)

An Interview With Marriner C. Eccles

HON. JOHN G. DOW

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1968

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, I submit herewith "An Interview With Marriner S. Eccles" which appeared on February 1, 1968, in *Forbes* magazine:

AN INTERVIEW WITH MARRINER S. ECCLES

His name and his face were once as familiar to the business public as those of his successor today, William McChesney Martin, but Marriner S. Eccles has been out of the public eye since he retired from the Federal Reserve Board in 1951. Now 77, and still hale and hearty (see *Side Lines*, p. 7), the blunt, outspoken Salt Lake City Mormon remains a full-time working businessman. He is chairman of the big San Francisco-based Utah Construction & Mining Co., a firm of which his father was co-founder. He is also chairman of First Security Corp., a Salt Lake City bank holding company, and director of several Utah firms.

Eccles first came to Washington early in the New Deal of Franklin Delano Roosevelt to serve briefly as Assistant Secretary of the Treasury. A few months later, in 1934, the President appointed Eccles to the Federal Reserve Board. In 1936 Roosevelt moved the then 47-year-old Eccles up to chairmanship of the revamped Fed. He remained in that post until 1948 when Harry Truman demoted

him. Stubbornly, however, Eccles clung to his board membership for three more years before returning home. He has maintained a keen interest in national, financial and political affairs; in 1964 he was an active contributor and campaigner for Lyndon Johnson. The interview follows:

You've been in business and in policy-making government roles under all sorts of conditions: wars, depressions, times of prosperity, inflation, deflation. How do you read present economic conditions?

ECCLES. I believe that our country today is confronted by the most serious economic, social and political problems, both domestically and abroad, in its history.

We've got rising prices, high interest rates and a balance-of-payments deficit. But these are only effects. They are not causes. You must look for the causes, and—today especially—that means examining economic problems in a broad context.

Just list some of our national problems—the very large and continuing budget deficit, the inflationary pressures, the balance-of-payments deficit, the lack of confidence abroad in our dollar, the riots in our cities, the unrest on our campuses, the split among all classes of our populace and within our political parties. I believe that all of these can be traced to a common cause.

Which is?

ECCLES. Which is the war in Vietnam. I believe very strongly that by ending or greatly reducing the Vietnam war, many of these national problems would be brought a long way toward solution. By greatly reducing, I mean discontinuing the bombing, bringing about a cease-fire and submitting to binding negotiations.

We know you oppose our involvement in Vietnam on moral and political grounds. Evidently, though, you oppose the war on economic and financial grounds as well.

ECCLES. Most certainly. Let me explain the economic predicament that the Vietnam war has gotten us into. Because of the war we now have a defense budget of around \$75 billion. This has produced a huge federal budget deficit that will run at an estimated \$28 billion for this year. Now, all this spending has come at a time when our economy was already fully utilized. There are no surpluses of manpower and production, as was the condition at the start of World War II. So we are getting inflation in our prices and we are getting inflation in our wages and production costs. We are also experiencing steady increases in our interest rates as business seeks capital to accommodate the high levels of both government and consumer spending. Now this has had an international effect.

Before you go on, aren't you ignoring the steps the Johnson Administration has taken to trim this deficit and control inflation with the proposed income-tax surcharge and budget cuts for the next fiscal year?

ECCLES. The tax surcharge, if it passes Congress, may bring in additional revenues of \$10 billion and slow down consumer spending a bit. The budget cuts the President is talking about may reduce federal expenditures by around \$3 billion or so. But that will still leave a very large, war-inspired budget deficit of between \$12 billion and \$15 billion.

You're saying that compared with the magnitude of the Vietnam thing, these measures are chicken feed?

ECCLES. That's right. I don't think inflation can be adequately reduced with a deficit of that size in a wartime economy. Nor, to get on with my discussion of the international effects, do I believe the Administration's moves are adequate to bolster the sagging confidence abroad in the value of our dollar. This is another major crisis brought on by our involvement in Vietnam.

That's due to Vietnam, too?

ECCLES. Well, to begin with, we have run

a deficit in our international balance of payments in 17 out of the past 18 years. This means the amount of dollars we have spent and invested in other countries is in excess of what other countries have spent or invested here. As a result there has been built up \$30 billion of obligations we owe to other countries due in one year or less.

Recently this payments deficit has been rising in rather alarming fashion. In the last quarter of 1967 this deficiency ran to \$1.8 billion; for the entire year it was approximately \$4 billion. This deficiency has greatly shaken the confidence of the world in our dollars, which, as you know, many nations hold as the reserve for their own currencies.

Now, our huge federal deficit and resulting inflation at home have further aggravated this lack of confidence. Our friends abroad are rightfully concerned about the purchasing power of their dollars.

They are especially concerned about the value of the dollars they own when they see that our inflation is caused by a nonproductive military venture in Vietnam which shows no indication of quick termination. The inevitable result has been a run on our gold to the extent that our national gold supply has been reduced by nearly \$1 billion since the British pound was devalued late in November.

What about the President's recent measures to reduce the balance-of-payments deficiency?

ECCLES. You are referring to the cutbacks in foreign lending of banks by \$500 million, the reduction of the tourism deficit by \$500 million, the \$1 billion reduction in foreign investment by U.S. capital and the \$500 million reduction in government spending abroad.

This is the program where the Government is expecting the private sector to absorb \$2 billion of the cut while it proposes to absorb only \$500 million. How could they do less!

Don't you think, though, that these measures tend to bolster confidence in the dollar?

ECCLES. Johnson had little choice. I'm sure our friends abroad put the "bee" on him. Certainly these measures will have a direct effect on our balance of payments. But these are strictly emergency measures; they will only temporarily ease the situation. They do not really get to the heart of the matter—our large budget deficit and inflationary pressure at home and the lack of confidence both at home and abroad in a country at war. These, I believe, will continue to erode the value of the dollar as the world's reserve currency.

Even if these measures are made in concert with a tax increase and cuts in nondefense spending?

ECCLES. Yes, because in my opinion the tax increase and the budget cuts will be too small to make a truly significant reduction in the inflationary pressures and psychology brought about in a country at war.

How about sharp cuts in the budget?

ECCLES. That's whistling in the dark. You simply cannot make big enough cuts in nondefense spending to counter the effects of the war. In the first place, no party in power would think of making nondefense reductions of the size that would be required—especially in an election year.

Actually, there is a growing need to increase nondefense spending to take care of problems of our cities, schools, transportation and foreign economic aid—especially in Latin America, to prevent the spread of communism. We are way behind on some of these needs already, and the war is preventing us from catching up.

How about climbing some of the strictly pork-barrel appropriations with which congressmen and senators favor one another?

ECCLES. They are chicken feed; they don't amount to very much. Besides, some of those expenditures for rivers and harbors are justifi-

fied by real need. And you can't accomplish much by chopping away at things like Medicare and the poverty program. They may be badly administered, but even now the amount of money being spent on them is a pittance compared with what we are spending in Vietnam.

How about putting on traditional wartime measures like wage and price controls to combat inflation? Or perhaps reviving the excess-profits tax?

ECCLES. Well, you could do these things, but they would be impossible to administer under present conditions and politically impossible to legislate. And they would not be a solution to the problems I have enumerated before.

Can't the Federal Reserve do something about inflation by tightening the money supply?

ECCLES. There really isn't very much the Fed can do in the present instance. It is obligated, as an arm of the Federal Government, to keep enough reserves in the banking system so the Treasury can finance the war as well as refund the tens of billions of dollars of its obligations falling due each year. This of course, only tends to fuel the inflationary fires. Now, if the budget were balanced and the debt were not so high, perhaps the Fed would be free to tighten credit under inflationary conditions. But that is not the case right now.

This did not prevent the Fed from clamping down hard on the money supply in 1966, when our Vietnam involvement and military budget were already quite large.

ECCLES. But that was two years ago. The budget deficit, even then, hadn't reached nearly the size it has now. Nor was inflation so evident then. You didn't have one huge wage increase after another producing a cost-push type of inflation. You didn't have rising prices throughout the economy. Nor was our balance-of-payments deficiency as acute as it is now. It's a new ball game for the Fed today.

You are saying, then, that the Fed is powerless under present conditions to combat inflation. Could the Fed have done anything, say, three or five years ago to prevent the current outbreak of inflation?

ECCLES. No, no, no. The Fed couldn't have done a solitary thing that would have affected the situation today. The Fed has been doing a good job. Now this war has upset the whole damn show.

You don't paint a very hopeful picture.

ECCLES. Not if we stay in Vietnam. As I mentioned earlier, the problems are not just economic. As long as the federal budget deficit is so high there is little our Government can do to combat the causes of violence, riots and crime in our country, especially in the cities. It can make little progress toward solving problems of education, housing, transportation, air and water pollution and the like.

Already we have had to cut back on our foreign-aid program, in no small measure because of our war expenditures. I believe that foreign economic aid should be increased in backward countries, not decreased. The best way to fight the spread of communism is through foreign aid, not through aggression.

In addition, we have this great split among our populace over the war, disenchantment among our youth, serious divisions within our political parties and a growing lack of confidence in our Government both at home and especially abroad—as witness the run on the dollar.

As I said earlier, all of this broad spectrum of problems can only ultimately be solved by our getting out of Vietnam. Consider what that would mean. Vietnam is the cause for the deficit in our federal budget, the need for a tax increase, the heavy spending that is causing inflation. These problems, in turn, are behind the deficiency in our balance of payments, the lack of confidence in the dol-

lar, the run on our gold supply. The war is the main cause of unrest in our colleges, the inability to cope adequately with the causes of violence in the cities and the splits in our populace and our political parties.

You certainly blame a great deal on this one factor. Is the war there all bad?

ECCLES. In my opinion there is every reason to get out of Vietnam and no good reason to stay there. But one of the most compelling reasons to get out is so that this country can maintain its world leadership. Losing that position would tend to bring about a very disruptive economic condition in our own country and throughout the western world.

The world needs a smoothly operating monetary system to support a rapidly growing world trade which would result in a world at peace. The basis for such a system must be gold and the dollar, plus adjustable drawing rights from the International Monetary Fund.

Now, the supply of gold is limited, so a strong dollar is of paramount importance. Even if the dollar should be devalued, in which case all other countries would quickly follow suit, the world could not live without the dollar to carry on an expanding world trade. The dollar is needed as the connecting link between all other currencies, so the threat to our world leadership caused by our involvement in Vietnam is critical.

So you believe that a change in administration is the only realistic solution to our present economic problems?

ECCLES. Let me put it this way: As long as we are in Vietnam and are spending so heavily to remain there, I do not believe we can cope successfully with our economic situation. Now, getting out of Vietnam will not suddenly clear away all our national problems. There will still be plenty of them left. But we would not be in the same dilemma we are in now.

We would not be wasting our economic resources in a nonproductive enterprise that we cannot win. And make no mistake about it, even if we are victorious militarily, we will still lose. Russia and China are only too happy to have us wasting our money and manpower over there and damaging our relations with the rest of the world.

A quick end to the Vietnam war would play hob with the defense industry and its supporting industries. Do you feel that some of the support for this war is from vested interests?

ECCLES. I think one of the real great dangers in our country today is the influence of the defense establishment. Let's face it. The defense industries like the business. As individuals I'm sure these men want peace. But in running their companies they want peace with a \$75-billion defense budget, too. These companies have a powerful voice in the Government and with the Congress. Now if these companies are to get the full benefit of their superior technology, for our own people as well as others, we must have peace in the world. We have the strength, we have the power and we have the capacity—if directed in our own enlightened self-interest—to win acceptance as a world leader for good.

If we were to pull out of Vietnam, what would happen? Wouldn't there be a swift diversion of military funds into domestic programs—with little actual reduction in inflation and the budget deficit?

ECCLES. It would take time to divert the larger military expenditures into domestic programs, and I would expect a leveling out more than an inflation. Johnson couldn't get Congress to appropriate funds that quickly or easily, nor would he probably wish to. But with the war it is different. Congress has no choice but to agree to the President's requests for money. Our boys are already over there, the defense contracts have been signed, the national commitment must be supported.

In other words, you think that some of

the Vietnam money would go into nondefense spending, but not all of it. But you don't favor giving all of the saving back to the public as a tax cut.

ECCLES. I'm a very substantial capitalist. If there weren't more and more federal money going to fill domestic needs, I would lose confidence in my investments. I am very much opposed to inflation as well as deflation. I favor government fiscal and monetary policy as the way to maintain production and employment at satisfactory levels on the basis of a stable currency.

And if the war goes on . . . ?

ECCLES. It would depend on whether it was a continued escalation or merely a holding position. In the case of escalation, our economic problems would go from bad to worse. Increased controls, war taxation and a much larger military establishment would be necessary. But if we discontinued our bombing and our search-and-destroy ground action and adopted a holding position, negotiations bringing about a peaceful settlement would in my opinion ultimately develop. In that case a tax increase would not be necessary, and sufficient budget cuts could be made to curb inflationary developments.

Eight State Men Die in War

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1968

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Sgt. Sherwood Reynolds, Sgt. Robert B. Selby, Sgt. Jon A. Julia, Sp4c. Roscoe E. Bryant, Jr., Sp4c. Frank R. Manello, Sp4c. Edward Singleton, Jr., Sp4c. James O. Feeman, and Cpl. George H. Dize, eight young men from Maryland, were killed recently in Vietnam. I wish to commend their bravery and honor their memories by including the following article in the RECORD:

EIGHT STATE MEN KILLED IN VIETNAM

Eight Maryland men, four of them from Baltimore, have been reported killed in Vietnam, the Defense Department announced yesterday.

Reported dead were:

Sgt. Sherwood Reynolds, son of Mr. and Mrs. Brookie L. Reynolds, of Prince Frederick, Calvert county.

Sgt. Robert B. Selby, husband of Mrs. Margaret Selby, of 6216 Falls road.

Sgt. Jon A. Julia, of Bethesda, Montgomery county, son of Mrs. Virginia S. Julia, of Washington.

Spec. 4 Roscoe E. Bryant, Jr., son of Roscoe E. Bryant, of 2436 Lauretta avenue, and Elois M. Bryant, of 1707 West Mosher street.

Spec. 4 Frank R. Manello, nephew of Frank and John Pless, both of 2402 Wilkens avenue.

Spec. 4 Edward Singleton, Jr., husband of Mrs. Willie Mae Singleton, of 1213 North Woodington road.

Spec. 4 James O. Feeman, son of Mr. and Mrs. Dayton P. Feeman, of 4926 Deal Drive, Oxon Hill, Prince Georges county.

Cpl. George H. Dize, son of Mr. and Mrs. Earl H. Dize, of Box 34, Ritchie highway, Crisfield, Somerset county.

WAS IN GERMANY

Sergeant Reynolds, 21, was a graduate of Brooks High School in Prince Frederick and had enlisted in the Army in November 1965. Assigned to the 9th Infantry Division, he had been stationed in Germany before being sent to Vietnam in October 1967.

He was killed February 26 by rifle fire while on a search-and-destroy patrol. In a recent

letter to his parents, he wrote that "things were going alright" and that he planned on signing up for an additional tour of duty in Vietnam.

Besides his parents, he is survived by four brothers, Sgt. Linwood Reynolds, who is stationed in Berlin, Pfc. Brookie L. Reynolds, Jr., who is stationed in Korea, and Allen and Clifton Reynolds, both of Prince Frederick; and a half-brother, Raymond Rice, and a sister, Miss Charlotte Reynolds, both also of Prince Frederick.

Specialist Bryant, 20, was killed February 27 from rifle fire while on patrol with a unit of the 9th Infantry Division. He enlisted in the Army in March, 1967, shortly after graduating from a Job Corps center, and was sent to Vietnam in August of 1967.

His mother said her son wanted to come home very badly and had written: "I'm tired of war and so much bloodshed . . . I'd rather be courtmartialed or go to jail instead of having to kill."

Mrs. Bryant said she raised all her children to value human life and added "It is sickening to know they have to go against what you teach them."

Besides his parents, he is survived by three brothers, Danny, Henry and Jerome Bryant, and four sisters, Mrs. Delois Briscoe, Miss Deborah Bryant, Miss Belinda Bryant and Miss Wanda Bryant, all of Baltimore.

ENLISTED IN 1966

Sergeant Julia, 19, was a native of Bethesda and had enlisted in the Army in June, 1966. He was sent to Vietnam last December. He was killed February 22 as a result of enemy rifle fire.

He finished high school while in the Army and had planned to go to college when he got out of military service, according to his sister, Miss Mary A. Julia.

Besides his mother and sister, he is survived by a brother, Robert Julia, who is serving in the Navy and is stationed in Rhode Island.

Sergeant Selby, 29, was killed February 22 while leading a patrol along Vietnam's National Route No. 1. He had been in Vietnam since August, 1967 and had previously served two years with the marines and three years in the Army before re-enlisting again in 1965.

In recent letters to his wife, he said that he was "disappointed in the war because of the attitude of the Vietnam people." He also requested numerous packages.

Besides his wife, he is survived by a son, Robert BE. Selby, Jr., and a sister, Mrs. Barbara White, all of Baltimore.

Specialist Manello, a 1966 graduate of Loyola College, was killed when his unit came under fire from a Viet Cong antitank rocket barrage February 25, the Defense Department notified his uncles.

The 23-year-old soldier had planned to marry in April. His fiancée is in the United States Women's Air Force and is stationed in Weisbaden, Germany.

CHEMISTRY MAJOR

A graduate of City College, Specialist Manello majored in chemistry at Loyola. He received two scholarships to study at the college.

Survivors include his mother, Mrs. Anna Manello, who is hospitalized, and the two uncles.

Specialist Singleton, who told his wife in letters he felt the war "didn't make sense," died of gunshot wounds when his camp was attacked by the Viet Cong February 25.

He had planned to meet his wife in Hawaii in April when he expected a leave. Their second wedding anniversary would have been March 12.

DUNBAR GRADUATE

Born in South Carolina, the 26-year-old soldier moved to Baltimore when he was a child.

Survivors include his wife (the former Wille Mae Johnson) two daughters, Naomi

Allen and Vicky Johnson; his father, Edward C. Singleton, of 1826 North Milton avenue; four sisters, Jacqueline, Yulcece and Sharon Singleton, of the home, and Mrs. Lucille Cookley, of 837 Lyndhurst street, and three brothers, Jeffrey H., Terry Lee and Antonio M. Singleton, also of the home.

Specialist Feeman, 21, died from wounds received when his infantry unit was attacked February 16.

He lived most of his life in Rolling Spring, Pa., where he went to school for nine years.

Survivors include his parents; a brother, Roy E. Feeman, and a sister, Edythe F. Feeman, of Oxon Hill.

Corporal Dize, 21, died of gunshot wounds received when the Viet Cong attacked his unit near Saigon February 14.

He fought because he felt he was "protecting our country," his sister, Mrs. Gerald G. Mason, of Beaufort, N.C., said.

He left school in the tenth grade at Crisfield and took a job as a grader operator in Oklahoma before joining the Army.

Survivors include his parents; a grandmother, Mrs. Minnie Dize, of Norfolk, Va.; the sister, Mrs. Mason, and a brother, Earl H. Dize, Jr., of Willards, Md.

Revision of House Employees Position Classification Act

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1968

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, the following material deals with provisions of the various congressional reorganization bills relating to proposed revision of the House Employees Position Classification Act which went into effect January 1, 1965. Additional information on this subject can be obtained from the Committee on House Administration.

The material referred to follows:

PART 5—REVISION OF HOUSE EMPLOYEES POSITION CLASSIFICATION ACT

Sec. 451. Application of House Employees Position Classification Act.

Sec. 452. Authority to recommend compensation revisions.

Sec. 453. Revisions with respect to position standards and descriptions and position placement in compensation schedules.

Sec. 456. Reductions in compensation level.

Sec. 457. Initial appointments.

Sec. 458. Establishment of positions.

Sec. 459. Authority generally.

Sec. 460. Conforming amendment.

Sec. 461. Saving provision.

Sec. 462. House Publications Distribution Service.

Ref. to pages 104-116 of S. 355 under the heading—"Revision of House Employees Position Classification Act."

See Final Report page 51: "6. The House Classification Act (Public Law 88-652) shall be repealed."

Comparison: S. 355 and Print No. 3 are identical, all sections. Bolling is identical to S. 355 in the following provisions:

(1) re position of House minority pair clerk—Sec. 451 in both bills

(2) re step increases—Sec. 454 in S. 355; Sec. 453 in Bolling

(3) re saving provision—Sec. 461 in S. 355; Sec. 454 in Bolling

(4) re House Folding Room—Sec. 462 in S. 355; Sec. 455 in Bolling.

The other sections of S. 355 are deleted in Bolling. Bolling adds new Sec. 452 re management survey.

Reid retains Bolling's Sec. 452 re management survey (which is Sec. 451 in Reid), and of the other bills the provisions re step increases, saving provision, and House Folding Room, which in Reid are Sections 452, 453, and 454 respectively.

NOTE.—Public Law 88-652 (approved October 13, 1964), the "House Employees Position Classification Act," became effective January 1, 1965. The background leading to this legislation and the purposes of the act were summed up in the committee report as follows (see House Report No. 1771, 88th Congress, 2nd Session, to accompany H.R. 12318, House Administration Committee):

"Background leading to proposed legislation

"For some time the committee has been concerned with the relative standing of certain House positions, the apparent inequity of salaries paid to the incumbents of these positions, and the piecemeal approach taken in raising the pay of such employees. Under the current House practice, employees who receive an increase in salary (other than the periodic governmentwide pay increases) obtain such increases through the introduction and approval of House resolutions. While such increases involved some comparison to other positions, necessary information relating to the duties and responsibilities of such employees was not available to maintain equitable relationships. As a result, the entire salary pattern of the four departments with which the bill is concerned has become completely distorted. Innumerable instances have been found where there is a differential in pay of several thousand dollars between employees who have similar duties and comparable responsibilities. As a matter of equity and because these conditions generate dissatisfaction, resentment, and poor morale, immediate action should be taken to correct the situation.

"Other areas with which the committee is concerned include titles of positions and detail of personnel. A substantial number of titles are obsolete, the designations have no meaning, and they do not reflect the work performed by the incumbents. Moreover, employees are detailed or transferred to positions for months or years and perform duties which bear no relationship to the work for which they were originally hired. This is neither fair to the employee nor to the House of Representatives.

"The committee's study also indicated a need for the development of tables of organization and functions. There seems to be some overlapping of functions and program responsibilities, as well as some diffusion of such responsibilities in a number of areas. Development of tables of organization, it is believed, will pinpoint the problem, assist in rectifying the situation, and help in creating sounder and tighter organizations.

"Purposes

"The general purposes of this legislation are—

"(1) to adjust salaries of employees in the four departments of the House of Representatives, namely, the Clerk, the Sergeant at Arms, the Doorkeeper, and the Postmaster, in accordance with the principle of equal pay for substantially equal work;

"(2) to compensate employees and establish a logical and appropriate relationship between certain House positions on the basis of differences in the difficulty, responsibility, and qualification requirements of the work performed;

"(3) to establish a system wherein longevity or tenure in a job may be recognized; and

"(4) to establish tables of organization to reflect staffing, functions, and program responsibilities.

"The committee is of the opinion that this bill incorporates the principles listed above and that enactment of the bill will not only eliminate a number of time-consuming and

inefficient practices in the pay area but also will inaugurate improvements in salary administration and in the management of personnel."

Sections 451-456 of S. 355 would amend the House Employees Position Classification Act by transferring administrative authority from the Committee on House Administration to the Clerk, the Sergeant at Arms, the Doorkeeper, and the Postmaster of the House.

The so-named officers would have authority to set and revise positions and responsibilities of existing employees, establish new positions, make initial appointments, etc.

See House Rule XI, paragraph 9(c), giving the Committee on House Administration jurisdiction over "Employment of persons by the House, including clerks for Members and committees, and reporters of debates."

The amendments made by S. 355 apparently would give the officers of the House new authority.

Bolling and Reid only—Management survey

Sections 452 of Bolling and 451 of Reid (they are identical) authorize the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, Doorkeeper and Postmaster of the House to contract for management consultant services for: (1) consideration and study of the feasibility of establishing an administrative management organizational unit in the House to coordinate activities of House officers; (2) review and study of the application, etc. of the House Employees Position Classification Act; (3) review and study of custodial functions, with a particular look at those which might be mechanized, and (4) such other related matters, etc. The officers shall submit their report based on above study within 18 months following enactment of the Reorganization Act.

Most Irresponsible Budget

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1968

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, in a recent column the respected economist and syndicated columnist, Henry Hazlitt, reviewed the new budget and found that the spending proposals "will accelerate inflation and further undermine confidence in the dollar."

The estimated deficit, he finds, even with an unlikely tax hike of \$12.9 billion, would be \$8 billion, making it the ninth deficit in a row and the 33d in the past 39 years. These estimates, according to Hazlitt have not been too reliable in the past, for last year the President estimated this year's deficit at only \$8.1 billion, just \$10.5 billion less than it actually is. In 1967 the deficit was estimated at \$1.8 billion or \$8.1 billion less than the final figure.

While the President seeks to put the blame for the large deficit on the rising cost of the war in Vietnam, the figures show that Vietnam expenditures alone cannot validly account for the increase.

Mr. Hazlitt suggests that the prospective 1969 deficit of nearly \$21 billion could be eliminated by cutting the 1969 non-defense spending to the level of the non-defense spending of 1966.

This, of course, the administration is not prepared to do. However, if the March 6 issue of the Government Employees' Exchange proves to be correct,

there could well be reason to hope that some fiscal responsibility will be effected by Congress. The Exchange states:

The appropriations of the State Department, Agency for International Development, Central Intelligence Agency and National Security Agency will likely be "curtailed" or "adversely affected" following the exceptionally heavy Congressional scrutinies of those agencies now taking place, the exchange was informed on March 1.

Perhaps it is poetic justice that the fiscal sins of the administration are at times visited upon its employees, as witnessed by the present scandals at AID. It could well be that the excesses of the prodigal sons in some executive agencies will cause the blindly benevolent bureaucratic father much sorrow. But here the analogy with the Biblical story ends, for the latter-day father is in hock, having dispensed funds not his own.

I include the above-mentioned column by Henry Hazlitt in the RECORD at this point:

MOST IRRESPONSIBLE BUDGET

(By Henry Hazlitt)

President Johnson's new budget is reckless and irresponsible. It will accelerate inflation and further undermine confidence in the dollar.

Total spending in 1969 will come to \$186.1 billion, the biggest in history—\$10.4 billion more than the current fiscal year and more than twice as much as (or \$93.8 billion more than) in the last full Eisenhower year, 1960.

The estimated deficit—even on the unlikely assumption that Congress will raise taxes by \$12.9 billion—would be \$8 billion. This would be the ninth deficit in a row and the 33rd in the past 39 years.

The deficit that the President now estimates for the current fiscal year is \$19.8 billion, the biggest in 22 years.

Mr. Johnson makes much of the fact that the deficit he predicts for the 1969 year—provided his tax increases are passed—will be less than this, only \$8 billion. Last year, however, he estimated this year's deficit at only \$8.1 billion, or \$10.5 billion less (on the same basis of calculation) than it turns out to be now. Also, he originally estimated at only \$1.8 billion the 1967 deficit that turned out to be \$9.9 billion.

So there is no assurance that the 1969 deficit will be any smaller than the current one, even in the improbable event that his proposed tax increase is enacted.

The President tries to throw the entire blame for the deficits and the unparalleled spending on the war in Vietnam. "It is not the rise in regular budget outlays which requires a tax increase," he says blandly, "but the cost of Vietnam."

This is clearly disproved by his own figures. Of the \$10.4 billion increase in the total 1969 budget over the current budget, only \$3.3 billion is the increased cost of defense. Of the total \$27.7 billion 1969 increase over 1967, only \$9.7 billion is the increased cost of defense.

Throughout Mr. Johnson's budget there is lip service to economy. He talks piously about "priorities," about "responsibility," about his painful "duty" to propose reductions. He devotes much space to discussing and listing 40 programs in which he claims to have made "savings" totaling \$1.6 billion.

One almost forgets that, nonetheless, the budget has gone up \$10.4 billion. Proposed new or increased spending programs do not get this same tabular listing, but about a hundred are specifically mentioned even in Mr. Johnson's covering message.

The President warns Congress that "faced with a costly war abroad . . . we cannot do everything we would wish to do." But it is hard to think of anything he has denied himself.

Two sample items: He proposes that the government "launch a program" to build 6 million new housing units over the next 10 years, beginning with 300,000 in fiscal 1969. He recommends "a new spacecraft for launch in 1973 to orbit and land on Mars."

What would he have proposed if there weren't a war going on?

The one need that never occurs to him is the individual taxpayers need to keep some of his earned income to buy things that he needs for himself.

The President makes no case whatever for his proposed tax increase. His figures make a clear case for eliminating the entire prospective 1969 deficit of nearly \$21 billion by slashing expenditures.

All that would be necessary (assuming defense costs can't be cut) would be for him and Congress to cut back his proposed 1969 nondefense spending to the nondefense spending level of 1966.

Freedom's Challenge

HON. JACK BROOKS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1968

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, this year's winner in the Voice of Democracy contest from the State of Texas is a fine young man, Gary Thatcher, from my hometown, Beaumont, Tex.

Gary, who is the son of Mrs. Leona Thatcher and the late W. F. Thatcher, has a keen insight and understanding of what democracy means to all of us and some of the problems which arise because ours is a "Land of the Free."

The theme of this year's contest is "Freedom's Challenge" and I believe Gary's winning speech deserves the attention of all of us. Therefore, I include it in the RECORD at this time for the benefit of our colleagues:

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

I heard the voice and then turned around to look. I could immediately single him out, even in the crowded grandstand. He was middle-aged, and a bit overweight. I guess the reason he stood out was because he was singing. As the band began to play the National Anthem, he took off his bright blue cap, placed it over his heart, and began to sing along. The people around him began to stare in disbelief. Some young boys to his left pointed at him and chuckled. The teenagers nudged one another and smirked at him. A few rows above him, a fat man with a cigar pointed and said, "Look at the Boy Scout." As the band played the final chords, the crowd sat down and waited for the game to begin. He sat down, too, and his wife turned and said, "Honestly, Bill, I don't know why you have to do stunts like that. Now, you've embarrassed me and made a fool of yourself." The man remained silent for a moment, then slowly turned and gazed at the faces of the spectators behind him. Somehow, he felt apart from the crowd—and yet all these people called themselves Americans.

This incident may seem a bit dramatic—but it is true—and it is happening all over the United States. An ill wind is blowing across our country. A wind that carries the smell of burning American flags, charred draft cards, and the stench of death.

Yet how can such conditions exist in America? The answer lies in the fact that Americans are free—free to meet in assemblies and speak out against the policies of our government with which we do not

agree—But are we free to have demonstrations in which we burn our country's banner? Are we free to have riots which lead to death and carnage?

We are free to worship in our own way—but are we free to use the pulpit to criticize our country's leaders?

We have freedom of the press—but can we use that press to degrade and belittle our government?

For 191 years, the United States has provided the highest degree of freedom for its citizens. Now comes the crossroads, when we must decide what to do with that freedom. We are all aware that democracy is the best system of government. Certainly, freedom is the right way of life. But it is also a liberal way of life. It can be mis-used as easily as it can be enjoyed. The moral question that we as a nation must answer is "How far can we use freedom before we abuse freedom?" This is freedom's challenge.

America has weathered internal strife and world-wide war. Surely we can restrain ourselves in our exercise of freedoms to the point that we do not defeat the purpose of democracy. When we do, the words of Abraham Lincoln shall be fulfilled—

"—that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

There is a very bright future—if Americans meet freedom's challenge now. Let's go back to that baseball game.

I heard the voices and then turned around to look. I could immediately single it out, even in the crowded grandstand. It was a feeling of unity—of togetherness. A chill ran through me as I heard the voices raised in song. And the wind caught the voices, and the mountains echoed the sound, and soon it was heard throughout "the land of the free, and the home of the brave. . . ."

Drug Abuse in Our Society

HON. JOHN JARMAN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1968

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, in recent months a great deal of national interest has been shown in the growing incidents of drug abuse, especially among the younger members of our society.

The hearings conducted last week by my colleague on the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, the Honorable PAUL G. ROGERS of Florida, disclosed many of the immediate dangers this country faces from the increasing abuse of stimulant drugs. In addition, his recent comments before the National Conference on Public Education in Drug Abuse give a very comprehensive analysis of the problems we face in this area, and will be of interest to the other Members of the Congress. Therefore, I am including in the RECORD the text of his speech before that group:

DRUG ABUSE IN OUR SOCIETY¹

(By Paul G. Rogers²)

First, the Food and Drug Administration, the American Pharmaceutical Association and participating members at this conference should be commended for focusing attention on the educational aspects of the problem of drug abuse. This is the long-range approach, the sensible response to achieve an ultimate solution. It is in fact,

the best way to control, reduce and, we hope, eventually to eliminate what has become a spreading subculture in our society.

Laws backed by strict enforcement are a first step to deal with the immediate problem. Often with prohibition, however, comes illicit curiosity, the desire to abuse for the sake of abuse, or to defy for the sake of flaunting authority. But with knowledge comes enlightenment and with enlightenment comes respect. Respect for drugs—their effects, their values and their dangers—is what is needed to enable those emotionally unstable people in our society to wipe out the abuse of mind, body and spirit.

And yet, as a member of Congress, I am addressing you from the lawmaker's view of the problem. But I see the law as only the advance guard in the battle and I am more concerned about the continuing effort in drug abuse education which is the preventive approach rather than the punitive. It is the preventive approach which should be the major concern of us all.

Drug abuse is an ancient problem. Man has exercised great ingenuity in conjuring up substances which will ease tensions—be they "ups" or "downs." For many centuries he limited these substances to plants and their derivatives. Along about the 1850's modern chemistry opened a new era with the manufacture of bromides to be used as sedatives. The tremendous demand for these drugs gave birth to misuse and soon downright, purposeful abuse, often resulting in intoxication and psychotic complication. Subsiding for awhile in the 1930's, the bromides were replaced by barbiturates, with their quick-acting properties. The last 20 to 30 years has seen widespread use and abuse of these drugs, commonly known as sleeping pills and pain killers. Here in the United States these drugs are purchasable on the black market and have been used either alone or in combination with other drugs or alcohol. This was one of the reasons Congress moved to enact the Drug Abuse Control Amendments of 1965.

In the 1950's, with the advent of economic and social pressures brought on by the post-war boom, the minor tranquilizers began to appear. They, too, can produce psychological and physical dependence. They quickly followed the path of the earlier sedatives, moving in the black market and being abused along with the barbiturates.

Now the stimulants, or the "ups," have been used in medical practice only for the past 35 years. The amphetamines have been found to have dependence characteristics which can lead to serious personal problems; however, unlike the narcotics or barbiturates, overmedication does not lead to physical dependence, mainly psychic need to overcome depression or fatigue or to attain effects of excitement or exhilaration. Dependence can start in the physician's office. But more likely it has its roots in the illicit channels of indiscriminate sale to such people as truck drivers who want to stay awake on excessively long hauls or to teenagers and young adults looking for new "kicks."

The degree to which the abuse of stimulant drugs stems from overprescribing on black market operations is unknown. However, the problem is serious enough to enlist the combined efforts of the medical and pharmaceutical professions and the federal government.

Another territory for the abuse of amphetamine was opened up when it was discovered that the drug was effective in stifling the sensation of hunger and hence it has been used for weight reduction in obese people. Now in this day of the no-cal colas, sugar-free candies, fat-free milk and other tasteless or unsavory foods, the obese person became fair game for the pill. While he might have thinned down, he many times found that he was "hooked" on this drug which also stimulates the central nervous system. The dependence-producing qualities of stimulant

drugs did lead to the restricting of the drugs to prescription-only status. This stifled the problem somewhat but did not eliminate it. Amphetamines are today a major medical and social problem.

So much for the stimulants and depressants. Let's consider for a minute the third classification of drugs of abuse—the hallucinogens. Irresponsibly promoted as a means of expanding consciousness, drugs such as LSD, STP and DMT represent an even greater danger than the prescription drugs because they have no known medical use, are produced in clandestine laboratories with no quality control and have so little documentation as to effect that they are extremely erratic and unpredictable.

LSD, for example, has been indicted for damage to chromosomes—the carriers of heredity—possible birth defects, homicide, suicide, insanity, panic and moral degeneration. This frightening triumvirate—LSD, STP and DMT—may only be a vanguard of an even greater and expanded psychedelic happening in the future. Stanley Yolles, director of the National Institute of Mental Health, testified before the Congress—

If I were allowed a guess as to the future, the next 5 to 10 years, I would predict one would see a hundredfold increase in the number and types of drugs capable of affecting the mind.

This prediction gives emphasis to our problems and discussions.

Every year in our society there is an emphasis given which overshadows all others—remember the folk singers, then the Beatles. 1967 was the year of "the drugs."

It would be hard to think of another period of time when the use of drugs and hallucinogens was so greatly publicized—or when so many articles and television specials concentrated on the mass use of these. Flower power, flower children, the Leary's and Ginsburg's, "trips" and "freak-outs" were exposed, interpreted, correlated, dedicated, motivated and assimilated into the American scene to the point that almost anyone over the age of 12 is quite familiar with them.

This was exposure, yes, but education, no. There were instances where the dark side was presented. But there were many more telling the story of young people turning to drugs—of the adventure, romance and glamor of drugs.

This type of publicity can be and is very impressionable to young people. And the fact that the number of young people who have tried LSD and marijuana has increased indicates that the underground communication, linked with the glamorous presentation of drugs, has recruited a great number of young people in the past two years.

As we have seen the number rise, we have seen the social philosophy towards drugs change along with the character of those involved. In the early part of the 20th century, it was the port towns and the poverty areas which had the reputation of indulging in drugs. Now we see the typical picture painted with younger characters, people in high school and college, from middle and upper income levels who are not needy of food and shelter.

The breadth of the problem is indicated by the fact that the illegal traffic in drugs annually is estimated between \$300-\$400 million.

So we find ourselves faced with the question of how to stem this trend. The Bureau of Drug Abuse Control, born from the 1965 drug abuse legislation, has established a four-pillared program to begin this battle. These pillars are—(1) enforcement, (2) research, (3) training and (4) education. It is necessary that each be properly developed.

The most important pillar is the fourth—education. It is imperative that we establish a program of education so that a person knows full well the consequences of getting involved with drugs.

It is my hope—and, I'm sure that of others concerned with this problem—that from

¹Footnotes at end of speech.

this conference and from the organizations represented, there will be formed a National Committee on Drug Abuse Education. This National Committee on Drug Abuse Education should exert leadership to initiate and coordinate a nationwide educational attack on drug abuse. Scientific and medical facts, films, pamphlets, personnel and publicity should be the tools of this battle.

I think that our major problem is reaching the young people. Although some may become involved with drugs because of adult influence, the majority of them become involved because their young associates sell them a bill of goods on the glamor of taking drugs. This leaves me with the assumption that our educational thrust should be aimed at our young people—in junior high schools right on through college. We must do battle to convert the same age group as those that push illegal drugs and dope seek to convert.

I know that dozens of organizations, the drug industry itself, societies and many agencies of the government have prepared pamphlets, films and so on for just such a mission. But there must be a more effective way to reach the young population rather than wait for them to request such information.

What I call for today is a unified, national effort to educate every young American on the dangers of drug abuse. To reach the total population of young people, I suggest a program already tried which could be expanded quickly into national use.

In Broward County, Florida, David Lehman, MD, and his colleagues in the medical association formulated a plan to educate the young people in the junior and senior high schools of the county to the dangers and problems of involvement with drugs. The idea was to work through the school system in such a manner over the period of a year that every youngster in the school system would hear, see and have explained to him the medical dangers of becoming involved with drugs. The physicians would deliver this lecture.

The bar association then was contacted and the lawyers volunteered their time to join in the lectures and tell the relationship between the law and those who use drugs.

Lecture materials were formulated, literature was handed out and movies were shown. When the program is finished this year, 48,000 junior and senior high school students in Broward County, in other words, everyone in junior and senior high school, will have heard the lectures, seen the film and had questions answered.

The presentation required less than three hours in each school. Forty physicians have donated their time for these lectures so far and when the program is completed, between 55 and 60 will have worked in the program known there as "Teen Alert." Total expense for the program to the county medical association has been about \$1,000. That's a small investment considering the stakes. We have a national problem. But national problems are just the composite of local problems.

I feel that such a program could be applicable throughout the nation. The resources available for such an effort are bountiful. And it would not take a great deal of national coordination. The basic work would be the responsibility of the people on the local levels. They know the problem, the size of the population which has to be contacted and what the needs would be in their communities.

Local groups would need help and encouragement from the National Committee on Drug Abuse and the organizations represented here such as AMA, APhA and FDA. The national groups could get together and coordinate a uniform set of materials. This would not be an expensive venture. As for the school boards, they would have only to set aside a few hours during the course of one week a year for the lectures at each school.

I hope this conference will help to initiate a nationwide "Teen Alert" program. The total school population will then be armed with the facts and we can do proper battle with those whose battle cry of "Tune in, turn on and drop out" has lured some of the cream of our youth out of our society.

Availed of the facts, young people would know that "tuning in" is tuning in to a society that has no future. That "turning on" means turning on himself and all the useful potential of which he is capable. That trying to "drop out" of reality can only be a fitful departure and that the world will endure, but the shadowy curtain that drugs offer temporarily will soon tatter and be replaced by a black cloak that will in the end envelop the taker completely.

Instead of hearing about the virtues of a "trip," young people should get the word, the word on how to use their lives instead of making them slaves to a pill or a cube. We should see to it that they get the word. If they get the straight word, I don't think they'll tie their future to a sugar cube. It's our responsibility to get them that word.

FOOTNOTES

¹ Presented at the APhA-FDA National Conference on Public Education in Drug Abuse in Washington, D.C., on January 11, 1968.

² Paul G. Rogers of West Palm Beach, Florida, United States House of Representatives member, is serving his seventh term as representative in Congress from the newly designated ninth district of Florida. He is a member of the committee on interstate and foreign commerce and the committee on merchant marine and fisheries. His subcommittee assignments include for commerce, investigations and health and welfare; and for merchant marine, oceanography, Coast Guard, merchant marine and fisheries and wildlife. Rogers received his AB and his law degree from the University of Florida with time out beginning in 1942 for four years in the U.S. Army. He served in Europe, earned two battle stars and the Bronze Star.

Developing New Kinds of Health Personnel

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1968

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, if we are to continue being instrumental in seeing to it that every segment of our society has access to medical services, we must accept the fact that the types of health personnel now performing duties are inadequate. In addition to the personnel we currently possess, what is needed are completely new types of health occupations; health occupations that we now do not have. We need health personnel who can relieve our physicians, dentists, and nurses of duties that could be assumed by other health personnel—health personnel that would be so trained as not to compromise, but increase the quality and scope of our health services.

President Johnson has proposed in his health message to Congress that we continue to speed the training of paramedical personnel. He proposes that new curriculums and methods of training be supported. The President's recommendations deserve our immediate attention.

A fresh and unbiased approach must be taken on the health manpower problem. A number of progressive experiments to develop new types of health personnel are already taking place in this country. Physician assistants, child care specialists, and orthopedic assistants are a few of the new types of health personnel being considered. They are not university-graduated physicians or dentists, but individuals who will be able to assist the professionals.

This entire problem requires a fresh approach. The new levels of health personnel will have to be defined. Their educational programs will have to be developed. A spirit of experimentation must prevail. We cannot afford to miss any opportunity to develop health personnel who are capable of delivering quality medical services to our citizens. Creating new levels of health personnel is just such an opportunity.

We established a foundation for providing additional personnel to the medical arts through the Allied Health Professions Act and the Nurses Training Act. As a member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee which produced that legislation, I hoped we could increase our manpower on these levels to ease the burdens of the highly trained physicians.

These people will greatly contribute to our entire health effort.

Britain's Receding Power

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1968

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, small wonder Britain has shrunk in world position. Her latest fizzle has been an attempt to interfere with the orderly governmental processes of an emerging nation, Rhodesia, over the execution of three convicted murderers and terrorists. But no protest was made against the tribe states arming, training, and dispatching these terrorists to murder, maim, and terrorize Rhodesians.

All this hullabaloo over three convicted murderers, yet not one word of protest against the Communists training these terrorists who to date have butchered thousands of Rhodesians indiscriminately, be they black, yellow, white, or brown.

Nor has Britain voiced any protest against the Communist Vietcong and North Vietnamese who to date have murdered over 18,000 American boys on a peacekeeping mission in South Vietnam.

Small wonder Britain has gone third rate—her leaders have not only lost their perspective, but lack the courage to distinguish friend from foe.

A recent news article follows:

IGNORING QUEEN'S ORDER, RHODESIA HANGS AFRICANS

SALISBURY, Rhodesia.—The Rhodesian government hanged three Africans today after rejecting Queen Elizabeth II's order commuting their sentences to life in prison.

A guard pinned notices on the gate of Salisbury's central prison announcing the executions of the three men convicted of murder and terrorism.

CONSIDERED RULER

The executions were expected by senior authorities in London to destroy all prospects of any early settlement of the long dispute between Britain and the Rhodesians, Sir Alec Douglas-Home, the former British prime minister, had indicated after a recent visit to Salisbury that there were some prospects for a settlement.

The queen, still considered head of state by Rhodesia's rebel white minority government, commuted the sentences Saturday.

But the appellate division of Rhodesia's high court, ruling on two of the cases Monday, held it was "not a personal decision by her majesty but by her government (in Britain). Her majesty is quite powerless in this matter. It is a source of great regret that her majesty has become involved."

Prime Minister Ian Smith declared independence from Britain in 1965, and Chief Justice Sir Hugh Beadle ruled Smith's government is the only one with the power to exercise the prerogative of mercy in Rhodesia.

CABINET DECIDES

The decision to go ahead with the hangings was understood to have been reached at a six-hour cabinet meeting yesterday.

The British Commonwealth Office warned that anyone taking part in executing the three Africans "will bear the gravest personal responsibility."

The executions were the first since the Smith regime declared independence. There are 107 other Africans in Salisbury's death row.

Name the VA Hospital

HON. JOSEPH Y. RESNICK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1968

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, in 1963 in Mississippi a single gunshot ended the life of one of our Nation's great humanitarians—Medgar Evers. Evers, a member of the Mississippi NAACP, devoted his life to the struggle to end racial discrimination and race hatred. And he left this world a martyr to the ideals of democracy and equality for which he fought.

It is fitting that the Jackson, Miss., chapter of the American Veterans' Committee is named the Medgar Evers Chapter. And it is also symbolic that the volunteers from this chapter have won special commendation from the Veterans' Administration for helping patients at the Jackson, Miss., Veterans Hospital.

Mr. Speaker, in keeping with the ideals for which this great American fought and the work to which he devoted his abbreviated life, I and a number of my colleagues have introduced legislation to honor him by naming the new VA hospital in Jackson, Miss., in his memory.

For the past 5 years, there have been periodic attempts to pass legislation naming this hospital for the late Congressman John Rankin. Without going into the details of Congressman Rankin's anti-Semitic, anti-Negro utterances, it is sufficient to say that his name has become synonymous with the very in-

tolerance and bigotry against which Medgar Evers fought.

I can think of no greater disservice to the memory of Medgar Evers and all that he stood for than to name this hospital after John Rankin. Indeed, I can think of no greater disservice to the Nation.

Therefore, I respectfully urge all of my colleagues to join me in support of this legislation—to honor the memory of Medgar Evers and the ideals for which he fought so bravely—by naming the VA hospital in Jackson, Miss. the Medgar Evers Memorial Hospital.

The 50th Anniversary of Czechoslovakian Independence

HON. THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1968

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, 1968 marks the 50th anniversary of the declaration of the First Republic of Czechoslovakia. I would like to join with the many residents of my 17th District in Manhattan and especially in the Yorkville area, often referred to as Little Czechoslovakia, in celebration of this day of freedom and self-determination and in memory of the great patriots whose labors for democracy are presently eclipsed, but someday will again hold sway.

In commemoration of Czechoslovakian Independence Day, I bring to my colleagues' attention a brief biography of the late Peter V. Rovnianek—1867-1933—a former New York City banker and organizer and the founder of the National Slovak Society. Mr. Rovnianek was a great contributor to American-Slovak fraternalism, and I salute his countrymen in celebration of their Independence Day. The biography follows:

PETER V. ROVNIAK, FATHER OF AMERICAN SLOVAK FRATERNALISM HONORED

One hundred years ago, on June 27, 1867, the founder of the National Slovak Society Peter V. Rovnianek was born of Slovak parentage in the town of Dolny Hrichov, county of Trencin, Slovakia (then Hungary). From his youngest days, he was proud of his Slovak ancestry. He loved his down-trodden Slovak nation. He was a brilliant student of exemplary character. He studied for the priesthood at a Catholic seminary in Budapest and Austria. With passage money provided by Monsignor Gibulka, he migrated to America in September 1888 and was soon sent to St. Mary's Seminary by Bishop Gilmour of the Cleveland Diocese to finish his studies for priesthood.

While at seminary, he wrote nationalistic and patriotic articles for publication in the "Nova Vlast" (New Country) printed at Streator, Ill., which was one of the first two Slovak newspapers then published in America. His articles took the Slovak-reading public by storm. In one of his now most famous articles, he proposed the founding of a fraternal beneficial society. The idea met with favorable response on the part of many Slovaks. In December of 1888 this paper ceased publication. The owners of the only other Slovak newspaper then in America, "The American-Slovak Gazette," published

in Pittsburgh, offered him partnership and coeditorship.

After long deliberation, he finally decided to leave St. Mary's Seminary and on June 28, 1889, he joined the partnership of John Slovinsky & Company as editor—feeling that the priesthood was not his calling in life and that he was better fitted to serve his oppressed people and subjugated nation as a journalist.

Under his inspired and prolific pen, the paper grew in circulation by leaps and bounds.

In editorial after editorial, he now urged, with all his might and vigor, that the need was great and the time ripe for the organization of a fraternal beneficial society by the Slovaks in America.

There were, at that time, about a dozen small Slovak societies in the mining and industrial towns of Pennsylvania and in the industrial towns of Ohio, New York and New Jersey, providing burial and sick benefits to their members.

After laying the ground-work and drafting the Constitution and By-laws for such a national society, he called a meeting at Allegheny, Pa. for Sunday, February 15, 1890 at Walter's Hall. Delegates from five local societies, with full power to act, came to the meeting. The Hazleton, Pa. society delegated Stefan Oravec; the Plymouth, Pa. society Anton S. Ambrose; the Pittsburgh society Peter V. Rovnianek; the Cleveland society John Miller; the Freeland, Pa. society Rev. Ludvik Novomesky, a Lutheran minister; and the representative of the Braddock, Pa. society was John Rybar. Then and there was planted the seed of fraternalism that was destined to grow into the world's first and foremost fraternal beneficial society of the Slovaks.

On the following day, the Constitution and By-laws were adopted; Peter V. Rovnianek was elected the first president; and an emblem with the motto "Liberty, Equality and Fraternity" was adopted.

In 1891 he played a leading role in the founding of the Zivena (goddess of life), the first Slovak women's beneficial society in America. He also played a prominent role in the founding of the Slovak Gymnastic Union Sokol in 1892.

In 1893, Rovnianek added to his multiplying and fast-growing business enterprises—which then included, among others: book publishing, importing of Slovak books and religious articles, coal mining and developing timber lands, steamship tickets and foreign exchange, which finally grew into a private bank with a branch in New York City.

In 1907, he joined with Rev. Stefan Furdek and other leading American Slovaks to found the Slovak League of America, which last May celebrated its 60th anniversary.

However, hard times came upon America in 1908 or thereabouts. Bank failures became common, everyday occurrences.

As Fate would have it, Rovnianek's Bank also failed to open its doors, one morning. He tried everything humanly possible to save the situation, not so much for his own sake as for the sake of the hundreds of hard-working fellow countrymen, who had entrusted him with their hard-earned life's savings; but again, all in vain. Things went from bad to worse. So, in July of 1911, he left all his belongings in Pittsburgh and went away, penniless, and settled in Nevada to start life anew, with the hope of achieving success and eventually making good the losses of his countrymen.

From Nevada he went to California and started prospecting for gold, still hoping for a 'lucky strike', so that he might soon return to the city of his early conquests and square his accounts with all. From the year 1911, when he left Pittsburgh, he remained in virtual exile.

In 1916, proceedings were filed in the So-

clety's Supreme Court to have him divested of his honorary presidency and membership, because of the money loss sustained by the society in his bank. Expulsion from membership, was the decision. Though kindly disposed, level-headed delegates, at convention after convention—adhering to the adage "To err is human, to forgive divine"—sought his reinstatement to membership, their number never was sufficiently large, and on November 16, 1933 he died outside the fold of the society, at Hornitos, California. That evening, after returning to his cabin from a hard day's work in the mine, he suddenly and unexpectedly passed on to the World Beyond.

Finally a half century later the membership of the National Slovak Society through their delegates at the 24th Regular Convention held in Pittsburgh, Pa., in September 1966 upon the recommendation of Supreme President, John H. Pankuch, righted this wrong by reinstating posthumously the deserving illustrious founder as honorary president of the Society he had founded and loved.

His remains rest in the Bohemian National Cemetery in Chicago, and a fitting monument—the gift of his many friends in America—stands on his grave.

Peter V. Rovnianek deserves the honor paid him by his compatriots and fraternalists for he was the Father of American Slovak Fraternalism, now a great moral and material force for the benefit of humanity.

Always a Congressman—A Well-Served Tribute to Former Representative Thatcher

HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1968

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, on the 18th of February 1968, there was published in the Louisville, Ky., Courier-Journal and Times magazine a very fine tribute, in the form of a feature article, to a former representative of this body, Maurice H. Thatcher, from the Louisville, Ky., district, who served five terms in that capacity—1923–33. The district he represented was made up of the whole of Jefferson County, including the city of Louisville, which lies within the district. Through a redistricting process in recent years the city of Louisville constitutes the Second Congressional District of Kentucky, and the incumbent Member of the House, Hon. WILLIAM O. COWGER, was formerly mayor of Louisville. The Fourth Congressional District, which I have the honor to represent, is made up of the greater portion of Jefferson County outside of Louisville, plus nine counties bounding the south side of the Ohio River and extending to and including Campbell County, opposite the city of Cincinnati, Ohio.

The indicated article was written by William H. Greider, who is in charge of the Courier-Journal & Times Bureau in the city of Washington, and his gifted pen has given a condensed but most interesting story of the outstanding legislative achievements of Mr. Thatcher, who is well known as an effective conservationist. His achievements in Congress as a Member and later as a civilian have been indeed multiple and notable.

The Zachary Taylor National Cemetery, including an appropriate mausoleum for the remains of "Old Rough and Ready," our 12th President and his wife, are covered by the two acts of Congress obtained by Mr. Thatcher while in Congress. The old burial ground of the Zachary Taylor family is now cared for by our Government, together with the right-of-way to the main highway on the east and 15 acres of additional land of the Taylor homestead, where Zachary Taylor lived until he joined the U.S. Army as a young man. This additional acreage was bought through a donation of funds therefor made by the State of Kentucky through its general assembly. The cemetery was officially named "The Zachary Taylor National Cemetery" at the specific request of Representative Thatcher, who was told at the time by the War Department that this was the only cemetery owned by our Government bearing a personal name; but Mr. Thatcher urged that the memory of Zachary Taylor merited such a designation, and it was accordingly bestowed.

This national cemetery and the old burial grounds for the Taylor family lie wholly in my district and I am especially interested—together with my Jefferson County constituents—in this connection. I am, of course, interested in all the other important things that Mr. Thatcher has done for his old congressional district and for the State of Kentucky, as well as for the Panama Canal and its employees, and in general for the Isthmus of Panama. He has long been called a benefactor of the canal and the isthmus; and in truth he has long been also a benefactor of Louisville, Jefferson County, and Kentucky. The featured story mentioned refers to much of the important legislative achievements of Mr. Thatcher, but not to all of them.

It should be added that since his retirement from Congress all services performed by him as related in the feature article have been of a gratuitous character.

Under leave accorded there is included herewith as a part of my remarks the indicated article:

[From the Louisville (Ky.) Journal-Courier & Times Magazine, Feb. 18, 1968]

ALWAYS A CONGRESSMAN: HE'S 97 AND RETIRED IN WASHINGTON, BUT KENTUCKY'S MAURICE THATCHER STILL WORKS FOR THE FOLKS BACK HOME

(By William Greider)

WASHINGTON.—In one of those distinguished old buildings along 16th Street in northwest Washington, the honorable Maurice H. Thatcher, former member of Congress, lives alone and quietly.

His spacious apartment is decorated in the good taste of an earlier era. Miniature landscapes and gilt-framed portraits line the walls. A large oil painting of Thatcher himself is flanked by cherished mementos, on one side his decorations from Latin American countries, framed on green velvet, and on the other side 14 pens that presidents from Coolidge to Johnson used to sign legislation that Thatcher helped obtain.

Small Oriental rugs are positioned about and around the dark and ornate furniture. The light from a bank of windows is screened by a row of tall philodendrons and snake plants which Thatcher has tended faithfully since his wife died in 1960. The air is warm and sweet-scented.

When I arrived, Thatcher did not come to the door. He had already opened it in anticipation; one of his legs has been stiff since he broke his hip several years ago. Otherwise, he appeared in good health. His hair was wispy white and his eyebrows were shaggy. He wore a double-breasted coat of blue with gray-striped trousers.

Things were arranged around his easy chair so he could work with a minimum of walking. He had stacks of files and correspondence on two side tables, sheaths of poetry he has written, a telephone, reading glasses, and, incongruously, a shiny short-wave radio set. Its silver antenna jutted high in the air, making him seem smaller beside it.

HE STILL PUSHES A FAVORITE PROJECT—A HIGHWAY LINKING SOUTHEASTERN PARKS

Thatcher was born 97 years ago, when General Grant was serving his first term as president, a generation before Marconi's invention. He grew up in Butler County, Ky., and became a lawyer in Frankfort and Louisville. In April, 1910, President William Howard Taft appointed him to the Isthmian Canal Commission and Thatcher became civil governor of the U.S. Canal Zone during the canal construction.

Later, when Harding was in the White House, the people of Louisville and Jefferson County elected Thatcher to Congress (Vice President Coolidge helped him open the campaign), and he served as the Third District representative for 10 years.

That was 35 years ago. He has made regular trips back to visit Kentucky over the years but, like the proverbial senator who never returned to Pocatello, Thatcher has remained by the Potomac.

Some would say he is afflicted with Potomac fever, but the former congressman does not feel that way about his temporary home in the nation's capital.

"I keep my citizenship back in Kentucky," he explained, "but I am domiciled here. I stayed here because of these public matters I was interested in. I felt I could do more good by staying here and could serve Kentucky and the Panama Canal better than I would by going back."

Perhaps the name of Maurice H. Thatcher has passed from popular knowledge in his home state, but Thatcher still considers that he is serving Kentuckians, pursuing many of the same things that interested him as a congressman.

He retains his voting rights in Kentucky, though he is no longer active in politics.

"I've always been for conservation," he said, and he is still promoting it. His present goal is one that he has pursued since 1931—a national parkway that would link the Mammoth Cave National Park and Natchez Trace Parkway with other major national parks of the southeast, Cumberland Gap, the Great Smoky Mountains, and Shenandoah. It is called the Cumberland Parkway project.

Over the years, with his aid, the proposal has worked its way through channels, including hearings on a Senate bill, and a survey by the National Park Service. The survey report is stalled for the time being because of the tight budget situation resulting from Vietnam.

"I'm still pursuing it all the time," Thatcher said in a crisp tone. "Senator Cooper and Congressman Natcher have been especially active on it. It just shows how you have to keep at it. Work, work, work. It takes great patience and something of the know-how."

He reflected for a moment on the length of the struggle.

"Of course," he said, "life is filled with uncertainty. I have worked hard, with good cooperation and good luck, but a thing isn't done until it's done."

Thatcher's efforts when he was in Congress did leave an imprint on Louisville and his homestate and the Isthmus of Panama.

He served on the House Appropriations Committee throughout his congressional tenure, a choice spot for influencing government decisions about such things as parks and roads. He savors the memories of those days, the complicated parliamentary maneuvering and the bureaucratic delays he had to overcome.

Largely through his efforts, Camp Knox was converted to Fort Knox, a giant military establishment and repository for U.S. gold. The George Rogers Clark Memorial Bridge was built over the Ohio at Louisville.

The list goes on . . . the "new" Post Office building in Louisville, the Veterans Hospital at Lexington, the old Marine Hospital (now Louisville Memorial) and another at Ft. Knox.

The battle cruiser "Louisville" was built on Puget Sound. Congressman Thatcher delivered the launching address and Mrs. Thatcher acted as hostess for the occasion.

"There were only going to be 10 more cruisers built and there was a spirited fight among the cities over the names," Thatcher said. "I rendered the necessary support."

The cruiser, he remembered, "survived World War II and, I don't know, at last count it seemed it was going to be liquidated. I don't know. The Navy could tell you." (The "Louisville" was rated unfit for further service in 1951, then sold for scrap in 1959 to a New York firm.)

Perhaps Thatcher's favorite recollections involve conservation. He sponsored the bill that provided \$100,000 to clean up and preserve the Lincoln birthplace at Hodgenville and to authorize all necessary funds for the future. He led the congressional push to establish Mammoth Cave National Park. His efforts produced Zachary Taylor National Cemetery at Louisville, a project dear to the Louisville Outdoor Art League.

The Lincoln birthplace, he recalled, had been taken over by the federal government after a private restoration of the cabin, but no money was provided to maintain the property.

"It had grown up in bushes and briars," Thatcher said. "There was no roadway into or out of the 110 acres where the cabin stood. The spring wasn't looked after and the water was not potable."

He said with pride: "It's a lovely spot now and it's free to the public. I have the pen up here that President Coolidge used to sign the bill. By the way, we got a bottle of that water from the Lincoln spring and used it to christen the cruiser 'Louisville.'"

KENTUCKY NEVER KNEW THE FULL STORY ABOUT MAMMOTH CAVE

Mammoth Cave was mentioned and Thatcher tapped his fingertips on his lip as he called back the details.

"Dr. Work was Secretary of Interior," Thatcher said. "He was an able man, but he was from Colorado and he had never seen our cave country. I heard that he was making a report to Congress of an adverse nature."

Congressman Thatcher went to call on the secretary.

"He said, 'Oh, all you've got down there are some old smoked caves. It hasn't national-park status.'"

"I said, 'That's not quite correct. There are newer sections which haven't been smoked up by lanterns. Furthermore, some of the smoked sections may have resulted from the production of saltpeter to make gunpowder to help win the Battle of New Orleans!'"

Thatcher then showed the secretary his own annual report from an earlier year. It specifically stated that the Mammoth Cave region "possessed national park status and should be preserved for national-park purposes."

The secretary, Thatcher said, "read this portion of the report and then, in perfect good humor, expressed his willingness to change his position."

In the end, Kentucky got its national park under legislation sponsored by Thatcher.

"The people in Kentucky never knew the full story about the narrow escape we had," he said. "All the fine work of the Mammoth Cave National Park Association and others would have come to naught."

His memory shifted to Zachary Taylor and the struggle to get a respectable resting place for the 12th president and his wife, and to establish a national cemetery in the president's honor.

"They were in sarcophagi, sodded over like an old-fashioned spring-house," Thatcher said. "It was a national disgrace. Everything went smoothly with the project until the title experts of the Department of Justice decided that a valid title to the cemetery land, the old Taylor land, could not be established."

Thatcher called on the attorney general, then confronted the title experts and pointed out that the original patent of 3,000 acres had been issued by Thomas Jefferson, governor of Virginia, to James Madison and Colonel Richard Taylor, the father of "Old Rough and Ready."

Would the government refuse to accept a title whose history involved three U.S. presidents? "It was just nonsense to hold the title defective," Thatcher said. The attorney general told the experts to approve the title and they did.

From Kentucky, the conversation moved to Panama, where Thatcher's name is still honored and prominent. In 1962, he cut the ribbon which opened for traffic the Thatcher Ferry Bridge, a \$20 million free span at the Pacific end of the canal. It replaced the ferry that Thatcher obtained while he was in Congress.

"For some strange reason," he explained, "those who signed the canal treaty in 1903 never seemed to give any thought to crossing the canal after it was finished."

Today he is the only surviving member of the Isthmian Canal Commission.

In Congress, he helped establish the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory in Panama City in honor of his old colleague on the canal commission, Col. William C. Gorgas, who successfully battled yellow fever and malaria on the isthmus.

The laboratory carries on the research fight against tropical disease and, Thatcher said, "We've discovered several different kinds of mosquitoes of the jungle which neither Gorgas nor the science of his time seemed to know about."

Thatcher also helped obtain legislation granting annuities to the civilians who built and have operated the canal.

In recent years, he has devoted much of his time to genealogy. According to carefully certified lineage, he is a descendant of Elder William Brewster, leader of the Mayflower community of Pilgrims. It distresses Thatcher that, while other early Americans have been permanently memorialized, similar attention has not been given to Elder Brewster.

He founded the Elder William Brewster Society to correct the oversight and serves as its president-treasurer. Active in other fraternal and patriotic organizations, Thatcher also holds the title of Honorary Life Counsellor-General of the General Society of Mayflower Descendants.

The former congressman picked up a loose-leaf notebook from a side table and talked about his poems, pausing occasionally to read one aloud.

He has written them for years and some have been published in newspapers and magazines and the Congressional Record. They celebrate important things in his life—the Panama Canal, the national parks, Louisville and Kentucky, and other topics.

"I expect I have written more than 1,000 quatrains on various subjects—some better than others, I suppose," he said. "I have always had an urge to write poetry, but I

have had to make my way in life; I have had responsibilities. I have not had time to publish."

At Christmas each year, Thatcher composes a poem and sends it out to friends as a holiday greeting. This year his sonnet, entitled "Christmas 1967," began:

*"My last was not, in truth, my last,
despite
Expectancy and what computers
say—
For oftentimes skilled Nature takes
delight
In adding to long lease a
lengthened day."*

Red Treachery

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1968

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, a very thought-provoking editorial on the nature of the Communist aggression in South Vietnam appeared in the February 16 edition of the New World, the newspaper of the Catholic Archdiocese of Chicago. The editorial follows:

ANOTHER PAGE ADDED TO BOOK OF RED TREACHERY

Anti-U.S. propagandists and sympathizers with the Viet Cong should be embarrassed a bit—if that is possible—by the recent news out of Hue, Vietnam, of the execution of 300 civilians and their burial in a mass grave. According to the story reported in the Chicago Tribune from its own wire service in Vietnam, Lt. Col. Phan Van Khoa, province chief, mayor of Hue and military boss of the Hue district, said that those executed were province officials, technicians, policemen and others who had been long marked for death by the communists. Does this remind our readers of anything? For those who care it should. It is a tiny leaf in the book of communist treachery and brutality—tiny, but bitterly reminiscent of that terrible chapter entitled the Katyn Forest Massacre of World War II.

In that chapter, 15,000 of Poland's finest military men—among them 400 key officers—were slaughtered and buried in a common grave by the Russian communists. In other lesser massacres and kidnappings, hundreds of civilians—from scientists and technicians to innocent bystanders—were carefully eliminated.

The truth remained hidden for quite some time. The Russians tried to blame the nazis. But it was later proved beyond doubt that it was the Red "liberators" who perpetrated the horrible but carefully planned massacre, to cripple the Polish nation and render it an easy prey for their own systematic takeover. May God forgive the U.S. leaders who permitted that tyrannical takeover that oppresses Poland to this day. Because of our peculiar diplomatic relations, no one was ever brought to trial for this war crime. The Russians were only too happy to focus all attention on the horrendous crimes of the nazis. It took the world's attention off their own crimes in Poland and other nations they wished to subjugate.

The same Hue report stated that from 125 to 150 Catholics had been led away from the city by the communists to what will be, we can be pretty sure, a more horrible fate. This, too, should bring back memories—to those who have no reason for such reminiscing—of the many thousands of Catholics and others who fled for their lives from the

communists in the North after the fall of Dien Bien Phu. No one knows just how many were slaughtered or driven into the sea during that flight.

Perhaps there is some excuse for the young demonstrators who can see no reason for our presence in Vietnam, no reason to fear the communist drive to take over the South. Most of them were still a number of years before birth, or at best in rompers, when these events took place. What excuse can their elders offer—those who devote their time and energies to discrediting the U.S. position and to formulating for the young programs and plans for disrupting and sabotaging U.S. military efforts?

There are strong indications that the slaughter at Hue was part of a large program, that similar massacres were planned for every area and city ravaged by the recent Cong attacks. This is hardly a new communist tactic. Applied in varying degrees with various methods, it has enabled Russia to take over much of Europe and Communism to take over in China and wherever else it is to be found. Anyone who thinks all of these events are disconnected, accidental affairs must be either the most forgetful, or the most naive, uninformed person alive. Apparently there are a lot of them. Anyone who thinks it could never happen here should speak with those from captive nations who felt the same way.

President Johnson's recent address to 11 college students invited to the White House was his umpteenth attempt to restate our position on this war, on bombing, and on peace. How can so many fall or be unwilling to understand? He pointed to the obvious treachery of North Vietnam and the Cong during the phony Tet truce. Can anyone sincerely believe that they want true peace or anything less than a total surrender of the South? Yet we find Americans who would urge negotiation with the North and the Cong, eliminating the South Vietnamese even from that much consideration. Such hardly fit any definition of "American" that I have ever heard of.

It is my conviction that we should be thinking about the victims of the recent slaughter, and, in a very special way about the five American boys found slain (one mutilated) with their hands bound behind them. Yes, thinking about them and the thousands of American boys who represent and fight for freedom in that far away land—thinking about them and praying for them.

Return Individuals to Active Health Occupation Employment

HON. LLOYD MEEDS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1968

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, if we are seriously concerned with the critical health manpower shortage facing this country, every possible avenue of approach, every potential solution must be explored. Retraining inactive health personnel represents a unique opportunity to add appreciably to our health manpower resources.

Individuals who have left active employment in the health occupations represent a group, that if they could be encouraged to return, would reduce the health manpower shortage. A significant number of these individuals, however, are reluctant to return because it would

involve brief retraining periods, the expense of which many cannot afford. Furthermore, those who still have children requiring their constant care cannot afford the financial burden of hiring sitters or paying for nursery schools while they retrain or work.

It appears that this potential pool of health manpower must be tapped. Every effort must be made to encourage them to return to their former health occupations. Retraining programs must be made available that will not place any financial burden on those engaged in them. For those with children, provision must be made for the children while the mother is retraining or working. This, too, should not be financially restrictive so as to discourage a mother from returning.

As President Johnson pointed out in his message on health in America:

Our increasing population and the demand for more and better health care swell the need for doctors, health professionals and other medical workers.

Yet we lack the capacity to train today those who must serve us tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the President that the health manpower shortage must be reduced and I submit that a partial solution lies in the retraining of inactive health personnel.

Make Buildings Accessible to the Handicapped

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1968

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation to lower the barriers that keep the physically handicapped from using public buildings.

About 22 million Americans cannot enter the buildings their tax dollars paid for because they are unable to climb stairs or because their wheelchairs do not fit through the doors. The concrete and steel that deny handicapped citizens the right to work, to vote, to learn, to play, or even to buy a stamp are unnecessary, unfair, and easily eliminated.

My bill would insure that all future public buildings financed with Federal funds are so designed and constructed as to be accessible to the physically handicapped.

Federal and State programs help rehabilitate and employ the handicapped, but there is no sense finding a man a job if he cannot get his wheelchair through the building door.

In Maryland alone, at least 200,000 people with orthopedic handicaps would benefit if public buildings were built with an entry ramp, at least one doorway wide enough for a wheelchair, stairway handrails, nonskid floors and reachable sanitary facilities. This is about 6 percent of the State's population—10 percent if you add the elderly and those less severely handicapped.

The extra cost of constructing future

buildings to make them accessible to the handicapped is negligible. Public unawareness rather than cost is the cause of the failure to apply remedial buildings specifications thus far. Action by the Federal Government would encourage State and local governments and private industry to do the same.

Some, but not all, Federal agencies have policies to eliminate architectural barriers in the construction of new public buildings. My bill would apply to all future Federal public buildings and future public buildings constructed with Federal loans or grants.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation was passed by the Senate last August. It does not initiate any major new Federal programs, and it does not add millions of dollars to the Federal budget. But it is important to all of us, and especially to the 22 million Americans who have physical handicaps which restrict their ability to lead full and productive lives. It deserves to be enacted during this session of Congress.

President Johnson's Message on Health in America

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1968

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the President has sent to the Congress his message on health in America. For his opening statement, he set forth five goals, which, as he says, "will require an unprecedented national commitment."

These goals are:

First, to reduce sharply the inexcusably high rate of infant mortality in the United States.

Second, to meet the urgent need for more doctors, nurses, and other health workers.

Third, to deal with the soaring cost of medical care and to assure the most efficient use of our health resources.

Fourth, to lower the shocking toll of deaths caused by accidents in America.

Fifth, to launch a nationwide volunteer effort to improve the health of all Americans.

In the message, President Johnson indicated the real meaning of the impact of the work of the Congress in the health field, and gave some very interesting statistics:

19.5 million Americans 65 and over, are now able to receive the medical care they need without suffering crushing economic burdens.

20 million children who have been vaccinated against measles, and 323,000 fewer children suffer from measles each year.

30 million have been protected against diphtheria, polio, tetanus and whooping cough, reducing by more than 50 percent the number of children who suffer from these diseases.

43,000 retarded children can now look forward to more productive lives because of the 150 special clinics built to serve them.

47 million Americans live in communities served by new mental health centers.

The life expectancy of Americans continues to increase, promising millions a longer and fuller life. In 1950, it was 54.1 years, today it is over 70.

We must continue our forward progress to insure the best possible health care for every American.

Office Staffs and Allowances of Members of Congress

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1968

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, as a part of my remarks today, I am inserting for the RECORD part 2 of title III of our task force comparison of various congressional reform bills which have been written subsequent to passage by the Senate of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1967.

Part 2 comprises some sections which have become obsolete as a result of action taken independently by each House since March 7, 1967:

PART 2—OFFICE STAFFS AND ALLOWANCES OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Sec. 321. Legislative assistants for Senators.

Sec. 322. Additional travel allowances.

Sec. 323. Telecommunications.

Sec. 324. Conversion of pay rates of Senate employees to gross rate basis.

Section 321

S. 355. Authorizes the employment by each Senator of a Legislative Assistant, who shall be in addition to staff already authorized to be employed by such Senator and whose salary shall not be chargeable to the Senator's regular clerk hire allowance. The new L.A. may be paid at (but not to exceed) top rate.*

Bolling. Same. Bolling adds a new section 322 providing that the titles "Administrative Assistant" and "Legislative Assistant" shall be created in the House. No change in allowance; simply a provision to create titles.

Reid. Same as S. 355.

Print No. 3. Same as S. 355.

NOTE.—Section not amended by the Senate. See Final Report pages 36-37:

"1. Each Senator shall be authorized a legislative assistant at a salary not more than \$1,000 less than the highest pay allowance for any member of the office staff. This position shall be in addition to and paid separately from the Senator's regular clerk-hire allowance. The legislative assistant shall have the statutory duty of assisting the Senator with his general legislative and committee functions." *Also see:*

"2. The Members of the House of Representatives should allocate a portion of their existing clerk-hire allowance for a legislative assistant with the duty of assisting the Members of the House with their general legislative and committee functions." *and*

"3. Except for the creation of the position of legislative assistant, no increase is recommended in the total amount in either Senate or House clerk-hire allowances. However, the maximum allowable salary for one position on the House Member's office staff

*Currently \$25,568. The Senate Disbursing Office no longer uses base rates; only gross figures.

should be increased to \$8,040 basic or a gross salary of \$22,230.19 annually."—This latter recommendation is carried out in Section 461(d) of S. 355, bill page 90.

Section 322

S. 355. Would provide additional travel allowances as follows: an increase from six to seven round trips for Senators, with an increase from four to five round trips for Senator's staff (two additional round trips for staff if State has population of 10 million or more); an increase from four to seven round trips for Members, from two to four for Member's staff. (See below.)

Bolling. Same. (See 323.)

Reid. Would provide twelve round trips for Senators and twelve for Senator's staff; would provide six round trips for Members, six for Member's staff.

Print No. 3. Same as S. 355.

NOTE.—Section not amended by the Senate. Recommendations are found in Final Report on page 38—

"4. In addition to the annual session trip of one round trip at the rate of 20 cents per mile, each Senator shall be entitled to one additional round trip annually (making a total of seven) and each Member of the House of Representatives to three additional round trips annually (making a total of seven) between Washington, D.C., and their destinations in the State or district. The additional trips shall be at the actual cost of transportation if travel is by public carrier or at the current mileage rate allowable in the executive branch for Government-authorized travel if by automobile.

"5. Each Senator's office staff shall be entitled to one additional round trip annually (making a total of 5 or 7 depending upon population) and the office staff of each Member of the House of Representatives shall be entitled to two additional round trips annually (making a total of 4) between Washington, D.C., and their destinations in the State or district under the same regulations governing Members' transportation."

See P.L. 90-86, approved September 17, 1967. No change in travel allowances for Senators or staff of either house, but Representatives may now be reimbursed for one round trip per each month or partial month that Congress is in session. For details, refer to House Administration Committee Report No. 559, August 17, 1967, to accompany H.R. 9837.

Section 323

S. 355. Calls upon the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives to make a study of the telecommunication requirements of the Congress, for the purpose of formulating plans under which the Congress would either participate in the existing Government-wide leased line telephone system, or establish its own leased line system.

The Sergeant at Arms of the Senate under the direction and supervision of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, is directed to formulate a plan for consolidating telephone and telegram allowances of Senators into a single allowance.

Bolling. Same. (Sec. 324 in Bolling.)

Reid. Same.

Print No. 3. Same.

NOTE.—See Final Report page 38—

"6. A Capitol-wide leased line telephone service should be established as soon as economically feasible to provide for the increasing telecommunication requirements of Members' offices. Telephone and telegraph allowances should be consolidated under the unit system at present used by the House and should be adjusted to provide the current level of allowance for other calls based on long-distance and Western Union rates."

Original bill language provided for this study to be made under the supervision of

the new Joint Committee on Congressional Operations. See Amendment No. 107, adopted March 8, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 113, part 4, page 5360, in recognition that work already was being done on this by the Senate Sergeant at Arms under the Committee on Rules and Administration and by the Clerk of the House.

Section 324

S. 355. A new section added by adoption of an amendment by Mr. Williams (see below), calling on the Senate Appropriations Committee to develop plans for placing pay rates of Senate employees on a gross-rate basis in lieu of the existing basic-plus-additional compensation basis.

Bolling. Same. (Sec. 325 in Bolling.)

Reid. Same.

Print No. 3. Same.

NOTE.—See Final Report page 52 for recommendation applying to the House: "7. The basic rate method for determining clerk-hire for employees of the House of Representatives shall be abolished."

Williams Amendment may be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 113, part 4, pages 5534-5535. The new section is now unnecessary since Senate employees are being paid on a gross rate basis.

The White House Message on the American Indian

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1968

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's call for the Government to be a responsible partner in programs for Indian progress and for actions to strengthen the partnership are welcomed.

Neglect through two centuries has left Indians of the United States generally in tragic conditions. Lack of housing, educational incentive and facilities, and employment opportunities all have contributed to the current situation in which unemployment among Indians is 40 percent, nearly 10 times the national average, and about 50 percent of Indian school children drop out before completing high school, double the national average.

The President's proposals, unfortunately, are not the entire answer to this tragic situation, for there remain serious organizational and administrative problems and defects in a system which has been characterized as domestic colonialism, and only a major overhaul of the Indian system will suffice.

But, agreement on a clear goal such as proposed in the special message on Indians would be a first step toward greater success in improving the status of Indians.

This goal, as stated, is to help Indian people raise their standard of living to that of the country as a whole; remain in their homelands without surrendering their dignity if this is their choice; upgrade their economic status without sacrificing their identity; and participate in the life of modern America with full economic and racial equality.

Address by Hon. Richard M. Nixon

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1968

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. Richard M. Nixon:

AN ADDRESS BY RICHARD M. NIXON ON THE NBC RADIO NETWORK, MARCH 7, 1968

In the course of this year's Presidential campaign, I will be discussing with the American people many issues—what I see as the nation's needs and its strengths; its problems and its purposes; the dangers we face, and the opportunities that are ours to seize.

Tonight I would like to talk with you about the number one issue of 1968—the number one issue in the United States—and the number one issue in the world.

This is the problem of order.

By order I mean peace at home, and peace in the world. I mean the containing of violence, whether by armies, or by mobs or by individuals. I mean the essential stability, the decent regard for the rights of others, that makes life livable and progress possible.

It was more than a quarter-century ago that President Franklin Roosevelt proclaimed "freedom from fear" as one of the Four Freedoms. And yet today, fear stalks our lives as never before.

There are many kinds of fear today—fear of the loss of individuality, fear of human obsolescence, fear of economic deprivation—but the central fear is the most primitive—the fear of physical violence.

We live today at a time of deep and fundamental questioning, when millions of Americans are asking whether their country can survive, and whether their world will survive. Both abroad and at home, the forces of destruction threaten our lives and our institutions.

Here at home, we have been amply warned that we face the prospect of a war-in-the-making in our own society. We have seen the gathering hate, we have heard the threats to burn and bomb and destroy. In Watts and Harlem and Detroit and Newark, we have had a foretaste of what the organizers of insurrection are planning for the summers ahead. The President's National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders now cautions that "in the summer of 1967, we have seen in our cities a chain reaction of racial violence. If we are heedless none of us shall escape the consequences."

Abroad, we have lived for a generation with the abrasive tensions of the cold war, with the threat of nuclear weapons, with the explosive instabilities of a rapid dismantling of the old colonial empires. We have fought World War II, Korea, Viet Nam, and the peace is still elusive. Still we live in a world in which tyranny and greed and fanaticism march behind the barrels of guns. Are we, then, to be divided forever into warring worlds?

And here at home, are we to become two nations, one black, one white, poised for irrepressible conflict?

On both counts, the answer is no. But we cannot have peace abroad by wishing for it. And we cannot heal the wounds of our nation either by blind repression or by an equally blind permissiveness.

The peace we want in our cities is not the illusory peace of an abdication of authority, and not the sullen peace of the dispirited, but the peace that springs from participa-

tion—participation in the processes of growth and change, in the excitement of the present and the promise of the future.

As they survey the prospects of our cities, some cry out in despair that all is lost, that nothing can be done, that The Fire Next Time already is licking at the window-sills. Even President Johnson said not long ago that "we will have a bad summer," and "we will have several bad summers before the deficiencies of centuries are erased."

This is not a time for Pollyannas, but neither is it a time to throw up our hands in helplessness. Violence in a free society is never inevitable—unless we accept its inevitability.

The first responsibility of leadership is to gain mastery over events, to shape the future in the image of our hopes. If the present Administration persists in its weary voice of defeatism, its tired counsels of despair, it will have abdicated this great responsibility.

We should not for a moment underestimate the threat to our safety and our stability. But neither should we underestimate the means we have of countering that threat. Above all, we should make clear to those who threaten that these means will be employed—and thus that they cannot hope to carry out their threats and get away with it.

For a generation now, America has had the chief responsibility for keeping the peace in the world. In meeting this responsibility, we have been learning the uses of power—and specifically the uses of power in preserving the peace. We have learned from our successes, and I would hope that we have learned from our failures. Those lessons are needed today at home as never before.

The first lesson is that the best time to display both power and the will to use it is before trouble starts—to make transparently clear to a potential aggressor that the price of aggression is too high, and the chances of success too slight.

A second lesson is that force alone is not enough. Force may deter a great power. But force is no answer to despair. It is no answer to those who think they have nothing to lose, whether among the hungry nations of the have-not world, or among those in our own cities nursing the grievances of centuries.

Only if we can light hope in the ghetto can we have peace in the ghetto—but that hope has to be real, and achievable, and it has to rest, not on the expectation of being given something, but on the chance to do something. It has to be the kind of hope that builds responsibility, not dependency.

In the case of our threatened cities, I am not making any flat predictions. But I will say this: 1968 can see a cooler summer, rather than a hotter one. I say it can for three reasons:

First, because we have been warned. The violence being threatened for this summer is more in the nature of a war than a riot. A riot, by definition, is a spontaneous outburst. A war is subject to advance planning. But if those threatening war can plan, those being threatened can also plan.

The second reason I say it could be a cooler summer is this: among responsible Negro leaders, there is a growing spirit of resistance to the extremists. After all, the great, quiet majority of America's Negroes do live by the law, and do share the ideals of the society we all belong to. Yet it was their neighborhoods that were destroyed, their homes ravaged, their lives made hostage to terror. And now their voices are being heard, providing a climate once again more receptive to the common-sense Negro leadership that recognizes that the only lasting way to progress is the peaceful way.

The third reason I say that it could be a cooler summer is that this is a Presidential election year—a fact which provides a

peaceful focus, a political focus, for the great challenge of combining peace with progress, and through peaceful progress bringing about a new spirit of racial reconciliation.

But we can expect a cooler summer only if we do two things, and do them both with compelling urgency.

On the one hand, we must take the warnings to heart, and prepare to meet force with force if necessary—making it abundantly clear that these preparations are made and that retaliation against the perpetrators and the planners of violence will be swift and sure.

But on the other hand, we must move with both compassion and conviction to bring the American dream to the ghetto.

I spoke a moment ago about lessons we learned abroad that could be applied here at home. There also are lessons from our experience at home that are relevant abroad. One of these is, quite starkly and quite simply, that what happened in Watts and Detroit could happen in the world, unless we move with a sense of urgency to create among the lagging nations and peoples of the world a sense of belonging, of participation, of hope, that has been lacking in the slums of our own cities.

The world is becoming a great city—a city in which communication is instantaneous, and travel nearly so, a city in which civilizations centuries apart in development are suddenly side by side. It is becoming a city in which the extremes of national wealth and national poverty cannot forever coexist in explosive proximity, without inviting upheaval—and the difference between the violence we have experienced in our cities and the violence this would invite is the difference between Molotov cocktails and the ultimate weapons of annihilation.

Another and more immediate lesson is that we dare not let the forces of violence get out of control.

All history has been a struggle between man's thrust toward violence and his yearning for peace. One measure of the advance of civilization is the degree to which peace prevails over violence.

Today, the apostles of violence are testing their doctrines—in Viet Nam, in Thailand and Laos, along the border between North and South Korea, in Africa, in Latin America, where roving bands of Castro's guerrillas operate. The old violence parades today in a new uniform. Both at home and abroad, it has wrapped itself in propaganda.

At home, it may masquerade as "civil disobedience," or "freedom," and it sometimes marches under the banner of legitimate dissent.

Abroad, violence calls itself a "war of national liberation," and tries to justify terror and aggression with slogans of social revolution. But the new war is still the old imperialism.

The sloganeering of the new violence confuses many people. That's what it intends to do. But when the slogans are stripped away, it still is violence plain and simple, cruel and evil as always, destructive of freedom, destructive of progress, destructive of peace.

The war in Viet Nam is a brutal war, and a terrible war, as all wars are brutal and terrible. It has cost us heavily in lives, in dollars, in hostility abroad and division at home—in part because of the Administration's failure convincingly to strip away its masquerade. But the men dying there are dying for a cause fundamental to man's hope: the cause of checking aggression, of checking violence, and of moving us one step closer along the difficult road to a lasting peace.

I have long been a vigorous critic of the conduct of that war. Our military power has been frittered away in a misguided policy of gradualism; if we had used our power quickly,

we could have ended it with far less than we are now using.

The Administration's failure to inform the American people of the full costs of the war—its failure to take the people fully into its confidence on the war—has sown distrust and suspicion about the war, both here and abroad.

But even more fundamentally, the Administration has failed to understand the nature of this new kind of war. This is different from other wars, and far more complex. It is a war for people, not for territory, and it cannot be won by military means alone.

Because of its failure of understanding, the Administration has failed to press those non-military measures—diplomatic, economic, psychological, political—that could have vastly increased the effectiveness of the military effort. It has failed to use diplomacy effectively with the Soviet Union, to enlist the Soviets on the side of peace. It has failed to do enough to enlist the South Vietnamese fully in their struggle—enough to train their military, and enough to give their people the hope, the stake in the future, the spirit of independence, that are needed if they are to have something to fight for, as well as against.

Only when our political, economic and diplomatic efforts are given a priority equal to our military effort will this war be brought to a successful conclusion.

Only this way can we get the negotiated end of the war that we want—not a military victory in the conventional sense, not unconditional surrender by the other side, but a durable peace in which the right of self-determination of the South Vietnamese people is respected by all nations, including North Viet Nam.

I think that with different policies the war could have been ended before this. I think that with new policies it could be ended sooner—though not as quickly or as cheaply as if those policies had been adopted when they should have been.

It is essential that we end this war, and end it quickly. But it is essential that we end it in such a way that we win the peace. And just as the cause we are fighting for is larger than Viet Nam, the peace we must be concerned with is larger than Viet Nam. The peace we must be concerned with is peace in the Pacific for the balance of this century. But Viet Nam alone will not secure that peace. It requires a preventive diplomacy, designed to concert the rapidly growing strengths of the Asian nations themselves.

We are a nation of 200 million people, powerful and rich. But there are more than 2 billion people in the free world. In Korea, the United States furnished most of the arms, most of the money—and most of the men. In Viet Nam, the United States is furnishing most of the arms, most of the money—and most of the men.

As we look to the future, we must establish conditions in which, when others are threatened, we help if needed—but we help them fight the war for themselves, rather than fighting the war for them. This means that the other nations in the path of potential aggression must prepare to take their own measures, both individually and collectively, to contain the aggressor. They must not be allowed to suppose that they can continue indefinitely to count on the United States for go-it-alone protection.

This is not a retreat from responsibility, and not a new isolationism. It recognizes three fundamental facts:

First, that the job of keeping the peace is too large for the United States alone;

Second, that among nations as among individuals, self-reliance is the foundation of pride and the cornerstone of progress;

And, third, that by establishing new collective security systems, the total effective

strength of the free world will be increased, and thus the Communist powers' temptation to launch new wars will be reduced.

We as a nation must still do our share, but others must do their share, too. In the long run, peace can be maintained only if the responsibility for maintaining it is shared.

What then are the prospects, both at home and abroad?

Are we doomed to live with an ever more terrible violence? Are the bitter agonies of these wars of the past and the present—the war in Viet Nam, and the war in our cities—to be magnified? Or is it possible that finally, after three foreign wars in a generation, and after the battles that have set our cities aflame and seared the soul of the nation, we can move on now to a peace of understanding abroad and a peace of reconciliation at home?

I say it is possible. It is not only possible, but imperative. But we live in a world of hard facts and harsh realities, and these make firmness and fortitude necessary.

Eventually, we can and must look forward to the day when the Communist powers will abandon the pursuit of their ambitions by military means. We can and must do all in our power to enlist them, too, on the side of peace and not on the side of war. I am convinced that in the term of the next President substantial progress on this front will be possible. But it will only be possible if we persuade them, first, that aggression does not pay—that just as they finally learned in Korea that they could not expand by the old-style war, they must be shown in Viet Nam that they cannot achieve their goals by the new-style war.

The war in Viet Nam is not a war to end war. But it is a war to make a larger peace possible. Only if this war is ended in a way that promotes that larger peace, will the cost be justified.

If we are to achieve a peace of reconciliation here at home, there is one thing we must make crystal clear.

We increasingly hear angry cries that ours is an unjust society, that the whole "power structure," the whole social and economic and political structure, is evil and ought to be destroyed. Whether the cry comes from extremists in the Black Power Movement, or from the far fringe of the New Left, the message is still one of intolerance and hate, and it still is wrong.

These mounting threats of violence come when there has never been less cause for violence, and never less excuse for rebellion. Never have we been so close to the achievement of a just and abundant society, in which the age-old wants of man are met and the age-old grievances of the disinherited set right.

There are injustices. There are inequities. But there also is a massive popular will to correct those inequities and right those injustices.

Equally important, we have the means to correct them in peaceful and orderly fashion. America was born in revolution. But the architects of the new nation saw clearly that if the society was to be secure, the means of peaceful change had to be provided. They built into our structure what the colonies had rebelled for lack of: a system by which the people of America could be masters of their own destinies, in which all could be heard, and the power of persuasion substituted for the power of arms as a means of bringing about progress and change.

This points up a major deficiency in emphasis in the recent report of the President's riot commission—its tendency to lay the blame for the riots on everyone except the rioters.

Among the causes of the riots the commission noted that "frustrated hopes are the

residue of the unfulfilled expectations aroused by the great judicial and legislative victories of the civil rights movement and the dramatic struggle for equal rights in the South."

It might also have included the inflated rhetoric of the War on Poverty, which added to the dangerous expectation that the evils of centuries could be overcome overnight.

One thing worse than not keeping a promise is making a promise that cannot be kept.

The commission rightly sounded a note of urgency, and it rightly pictured the task ahead in the cities' slums as massive.

But it would be unrealistic to raise hopes that the vast programs the commission proposed might all be done at once.

And it would also be a disservice to suggest to the dwellers in those slums that they need only wait for Federal housing, Federal jobs, a Federally guaranteed income.

Jobs, housing—all the things of the better life—will come, ultimately, when two things happen: when private enterprise gets into the ghetto, and when the people in the ghetto get into private enterprise—as workers, as managers, as owners.

We can and must make far greater progress than we have, but we can only do so by a far greater enlistment of private enterprise in rebuilding the cities, in providing the jobs, in constructing the housing.

During the course of this campaign I will be recommending programs to move us toward this goal.

More than almost any of the great issues facing America today the tortured problem of race requires a careful balance and a clear perspective. Much that is desirable, much that is urgent, takes time to achieve.

America still is going through an agony of transition.

It takes time for old myths to give way to new awareness.

It takes time to erase the old stereotypes.

But the point is that we are moving forward, and moving rapidly, toward what the riot commission refers to as a "single society"—one nation, one people, one common ideal, in which each person is measured as an individual, and in which legal rights are fleshed out with actual opportunities.

We must do more. But if progress is to be made, the first essential now is order.

The riots shook the nation to a new awareness of how deep were Negro resentment, how explosive the grievances long suppressed. But that lesson has been learned. And those who now cry "burn" tempt a new conflagration that could engulf not only the cities, but all the racial progress made in these troubled years.

Excesses on one side bring excesses on the other; we could too readily be drawn into a spiral of violence and vengeance. We can ill afford the destruction of our cities; we could even less afford the ravaging of our society.

We cannot be complacent about our country's faults, but neither should we be apologetic about its strengths.

What began in rebellion nearly 200 years ago has become a peaceful revolution and a permanent revolution—a revolution that has transformed the world, and that has stood for these two centuries as a beacon for man's aspirations and a symbol of his liberties.

This permanent revolution is not yet finished. Lincoln freed the slaves. Our uncompleted task is to free the Negro. Franklin Roosevelt promulgated the old, negative freedoms from. Our uncompleted task is to make real the new, positive freedoms to.

The architects of our country provided the means for peaceful change. Our uncompleted task is to damp the fires of violent change, to cement our mastery of the pace of change, and to make the most of our opportunity for constructive change.

Change is the essence of progress. But there can be no progress without order, no

freedom without order, no justice without order.

And so our first commitment as a nation, in this time of crisis and questioning, must be a commitment to order.

This is the commitment that makes all else possible. This is the commitment that is needed if our unfinished agenda is to be finished, and the American Revolution—the permanent, peaceful revolution—is to fulfill its promise to mankind.

Meeting the Challenge of America's Urban Crisis

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1968

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, the crisis in America's cities did not come upon us overnight. It has developed over a period of time. But, now, we are running out of time. We no longer can look at theories that, may, sometime in the future, take shape as solutions.

We must look at the present. We must look at the programs that offer the best hope of bringing about the swiftest resolution of the problems facing our cities today.

By creating solutions to today's problems we are, I believe, preventing other problems from surfacing tomorrow.

This Congress already has enacted into law two programs which are good tools for meeting America's urban crisis.

These programs, model cities and rent supplements, offer solutions to the blight and decay that is creeping through the hearts of America's urban centers.

Model cities is already off the ground. The first 63 cities to come under the program are in the process of planning their future courses. The next round of cities to receive model cities planning grants, I understand, will be announced in the near future.

But we cannot stop here. The President has requested a \$1 billion authorization for model cities. We should not refuse a sum which is modest when one considers the magnitude of the problem.

Model cities is more than just a physical plan for urban rehabilitation. Local plans under the model cities program calls for human revitalization as well. Some plans call for an entirely new urban environment, some the rebuilding of neighborhoods, and some the revitalization of the social and economic conditions as well as the physical rebuilding.

This program can be the catalyst for the rebirth of urban America.

The rent supplement program deals with the human factors. One of the most imaginative housing programs to be enacted in many years, the rent supplement program offers a helping hand to less fortunate citizens who need a decent place to live.

In the less than 2 years that rent supplement assistance has been available, some 42,000 housing units are under contract for payment or are in some phase of construction.

Congress has authorized \$42 million for the program. These funds have nearly been exhausted. The President has requested an additional \$65 million for the program in fiscal 1969. These funds will provide assistance to some 72,000 more families and individuals.

The rent supplement program is offering hope to citizens who before had none. It is offering the decent housing conditions that should, but unfortunately do not, exist for all people.

And it is a program being carried out with our greatest production device—private enterprise. Private sponsors plan the project; private lending institutions provide the financing, and private contractors build the structures.

This is the kind of cooperation that produces solutions. Both the model cities program and the rent supplement program have the same goal in view—better living conditions for all people. Though keyed to the needs of low- and moderate-income families, these programs can, and are, providing the tools for a better overall community life.

But today's housing needs cannot be solved by these two programs alone. Other programs are being proposed. Others expanded, and others streamlined for more effectiveness.

Two of these proposals deal with an interest rate subsidy program.

In the homeownership program, the family would pay 20 percent of its monthly income towards the housing expense—principal, interest, taxes, insurance, mortgage insurance premium. The Department of Housing and Urban Development would pay the difference between that amount computed on a 1 percent mortgage and the total monthly payment required under a market rate mortgage.

The rental housing program would work essentially the same way, except that the payments by HUD would be on a project mortgage. The sponsor of the project would make payments that would be required on a mortgage bearing a 1-percent interest rate. HUD's payment would be the difference between that amount and the total required monthly charges on a market rate interest loan. In both cases, payments are made directly to the lender.

Both these programs offer an opportunity for less fortunate citizens to live better than they believed they could.

We cannot stop now. We cannot rest on what we have done in the past because that has not been enough. We cannot set aside this Nation's commitment. Today, the difficult task at hand calls for us to marshal behind the President's call for building, and rebuilding, a better America.

Joe Martin

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1968

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, my fellow colleagues and I will remember Joe Martin as a man who was

friendly and helpful to all new Members. A man of keen intellect, he was an outstanding statesman and member of the House Science and Astronautics Committee and a man admired by all who knew him. A kind and gentle man, he proved to be an outstanding leader. We in the House of Representatives were privileged to know him and work with him. We and the American people will have suffered a loss, and will remember him with affection.

Vietnam Pacification

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1968

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, the recent Communist Tet offensive in South Vietnam exploded, once and for all, the myth that the "other war" in Vietnam, the pacification program to improve the life of the Vietnamese people, was meeting with some success. The Tet offensive revealed the total inability of the South Vietnamese Government, with all the massive aid of the United States, to provide security for the large numbers of people in the countryside and the city.

The campaign to win the minds and hearts of the Vietnamese people has not succeeded. Vast corruption in the Saigon regime makes any meaningful reform impossible.

Mr. Speaker, it is in this context that I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a penetrating article by John W. Koler, of the Milwaukee Journal Washington bureau, on the Vietnamese pacification program, which appeared in the Milwaukee Journal on March 3, 1968:

"OTHER WAR" LOSSES IN TET RED PUSH
(By John W. Koler)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Almost 18 months ago, Robert W. Komer sat down to write a letter to his boss, Lyndon B. Johnson. As the special assistant in charge of the so-called "other war" in Vietnam—the one to win the hearts and minds of the people—Komer said that he would not "overstate the progress to date." Nevertheless, Komer submitted to the president the "first comprehensive report" on pacification and at that time he found much to cheer about.

"I believe that it demonstrates both real progress and growing momentum in the joint Vietnamese-United States effort to move that country forward, even in the midst of war," he said. "At the same time as it resists aggression, South Vietnam is increasingly coming to grips with the need to modernize its society, bolster its civil economy, develop its representative institutions and provide a better life for its people."

Last July, now carrying the rank of ambassador as Gen. William Westmoreland's top deputy on pacification, Komer came back to Washington from Saigon for a brief visit. On a national television program he seemed to retract his position of past progress, but he remained optimistic.

"I think we have not been making much progress in the past," he said, "but (we) should be able to make considerably more in the future. We are finally at an upward curve."

Last weekend, three weeks after the beginning of the devastating Vietcong offensive, Komer held a press briefing in Saigon. Finally, almost all of the optimism was stripped away.

PSYCHOLOGICAL SETBACK

"There has been a loss of momentum, there has been some withdrawal (of security troops) from the countryside, there has been a significant psychological setback both on the part of the pacification people themselves and the local population," Komer said.

(Under the ground rules of the Saigon briefing Komer was not identified, but was referred to as a "high official.")

"Unquestionably there's been a considerable setback. The real question now is who will fill the vacuum in the countryside. It depends on how fast the South Vietnamese government moves in and how aggressive and how fast the enemy will be. We hope the government can show the population things are returning to normal."

A couple of days later, Komer flew here with Gen. Earle G. Wheeler, chairman of the joint chiefs of staff. Most of the talk was about another increase in the American military commitment. As for pacification there was a serious question whether the program ever would return to normal, whatever that might be.

For the evidence was fast accumulating that Johnson had decided to go all-out in the war. Certainly no de-escalation was in the picture during his flag waving Dallas speech: "There must be no breaking of our trusted commitments . . . no failing of our fighting sons . . . no betrayal of those who fight beside us . . . no weakening of will that would encourage the enemy and prolong the bloody conflict."

Following up on Komer's briefing, William P. Bundy, assistant secretary of state for the far east, gave another gloomy assessment: "They (the Vietcong) did cause a lot of damage. They did shake people's faith in the government's ability to maintain security in the cities which hitherto have been immune. I only say it is going to be a very tough period." Admittedly, the United States embarked upon an almost impossible task in its pacification program, or, as the agency for international development (AID) put it last month, "It was an unprecedented effort to help relieve human suffering and build a nation in the midst of war." Half a billion dollars in increasingly scarce AID funds have been poured into the effort in recent years.

"AID grants and revenues originating from AID imports provided about one-third of South Vietnam's budget of nearly \$700 million and much of the cost of the new 'revolutionary development' program to improve life at the hamlet level," the agency has reported.

Compared to the war cost of \$30 billion a year or more, this is little enough. But serious questions continue to be posed about the commitment of the 17 million Vietnamese people—80% of them in rural areas—to a government which has been unable or unwilling to root out corruption.

TED KENNEDY'S REPORT

In January, after returning from an inspection trip to South Vietnam, Sen. Edward M. Kennedy (D-Mass.) declared that "corruption pervades all aspects of Vietnamese life and it is brazenly practiced."

As an example, Kennedy told of an American scholarship program for Vietnamese army veterans. The first list consisted mostly of relatives of government officials. A second list was demanded but it was discovered that the new applicants had to promise a percentage of their scholarship payments to the officials who chose them.

The senator cited the refugee relief program which is costing the United States \$30 million a year.

"In my many conversations with the hard pressed American refugee personnel it was estimated that only half of the supplies ever reach the refugees," Kennedy said. "The officials of the government of South Vietnam and the province chiefs supported by them have the keys to the warehouses and they keep much of the goods for themselves. Each refugee is supposed to receive the equivalent of \$45 for resettlement. It was estimated to me by a United States official adviser to the refugee program that 75% of this amount is siphoned off before it reaches these people."

The total refugee population has been called "the biggest numbers game in Vietnam." The South Vietnamese government has prepared a statistical map showing that about 2,100,000 persons were dislocated between January, 1964, and November, 1967. However, some say there are 4,000,000 refugees or more. That would be almost a quarter of the population.

At the end of 1967, American officials in South Vietnam said that a computer had determined that two-thirds of the population lived in areas secure from the Vietcong. But those figures now have to be thrown out.

"Now we have seen that after six years of fighting, the presence of half a million American men, more than 16,000 American boys killed and 100,000 wounded, there is no place in Vietnam that is secure—from the smallest hamlet in the jungle to the new indoor skating rink in Vietnam," Kennedy declared recently.

SOME BUDDHISTS ANGRY

However, a few pacification officials contend that the Communist offensive could backfire. They note that some religious groups, including the Buddhists, have condemned the Communists for launching the attack during Tet, the lunar new year, the most important Vietnamese holiday.

But even those officials who remain optimistic agree that pacification cannot hope to succeed unless a hamlet or village (the computer study included all 12,650 hamlets, of which only about 50 were damaged in the offensive) is physically secure from Vietcong reprisal and the people feel relatively safe.

As Komer himself put it before the offensive, "Without continuous security to keep the Vietcong away from the farmer, the rest of pacification can't even get under way."

The growth in numbers last year of those working in pacification was impressive—up to 500,000 citizens in all phases.

Trained South Vietnamese cadremen working in the hamlets went up from 28,000 to 41,000. During 1966 no South Vietnamese regular army troops were committed, but 30,000 were assigned at the end of last year, plus 152,000 regional and provincial troops. Civil servants in the program were up from 49,000 to 60,000.

American advisers include about 3,900 persons, 2,700 military and 1,200 civilian. Before the offensive there were American advisers in all 44 provinces and 222 of the 245 districts.

However, some American officials take the position that the United States must crack down on the South Vietnamese government to make any substantial progress.

Said one official in Saigon recently: "I think this government is incapable of reforming itself and that only the strongest American pressure, including a United States threat of withdrawal of support, can force a reform. We've got to get tougher with these people."

But as harsh a commentary as any came last week from Arthur Gardiner, former director of the American foreign aid mission in Saigon and now executive director here of International Voluntary Services, a private nonprofit organization which has dozens of volunteers in South Vietnam. He said there was much hatred for Americans in Vietnam

and decried the "major land war in Asia which our military leaders have said we should avoid at all costs."

As far as Gardiner is concerned, the present course of American action is "creating more Vietcong than we are destroying."

The Unit Load System

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1968

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, as you know I have long been interested in merchant shipping, having spent 8 years as a member of the House Committee of Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Inasmuch as the Port of Oakland and Encinal Terminals in Alameda, Calif., are in my district I have kept a close interest in matters affecting world trade and transportation.

Recently I read a speech by a friend of mine, part of which I will include later as an extension to my remarks, in which he outlined the attributes and advantages of the unit load system using units of cargo on pallets and loading them on side port ships. Although the carrier involved, Fred. Olsen Intercoastal Line, is a foreign-flag operator, they have the only side port vessels in the Pacific Coast European trade and more importantly these vessels load cargo for Europe at the ports in my district.

This innovation, side ports and unit loads, has resulted in reduced costs of moving cargo and has provided economies all down the line for the benefit of shippers and receivers as well as the carrier.

With competition developing from other parts of the world in many of the agricultural products produced by California it is important for the economy of our State to be able to compete in the world market. Through such innovations as the unit load system California products will continue to be competitive.

Another facet of this new development in transportation which particularly appeals to me is that management and labor on the Pacific Coast have worked out a mutually beneficial contract which provides labor with a good standard-of-living wage, while at the same time permitting labor to handle more cargo through mechanization, with less wear and tear on men's backs and bodies. To me this is a very significant improvement and development.

In my opinion both the International Longshoremen's & Warehousemen's Union and Pacific Maritime Association are to be congratulated for this foresighted progressive arrangement. In return for a higher wage, management is able to automate. This automation is accomplished in two ways, through the use of units and through the use of containerization.

Normally, an 18- to 22-man longshore gang will load about 20 tons of loose general cargo per hour. Recently the M/S *Buffalo*, Fred. Olsen Intercoastal Line, at Howard Terminal, Port of Oakland, loaded 965 tons of unitized cargo in 10 hours using side ports.

Mr. Speaker, following is an excerpt from a talk given by J. Monroe Sullivan, vice president, Interolsen Agencies, Inc., general agent for Fred. Olsen Interocean Line. This talk was given in San Jose to a group of exporters of canned and dried fruits whose tonnage moves through port facilities of my district.

Originally transportation laws in the United States were designed to protect the public from the carrier. Later changes were made designed to permit various modes of transportation to develop, i.e., the infant industry was protected and encouraged. Then transportation laws were developed to encourage competition among the various modes of transportation. Now all of a sudden there seems to be a feeling that many laws must be changed to permit and encourage cooperation in order to accommodate intermodal transportation. The unit load system to be effective does not require any changes in transportation laws because we do not have the problem of interchange of equipment agreements with unit loads. Interline agreements can be made to provide the kind of through movement that is desirable.

Some changes in transportation legislation would be desirable, but my point is that the unit load system can operate within today's framework much more effectively than can any competing system.

With the unit load system, using side port ships, we offer easier control of shipment movement, safety, efficiency, less handling, economy, faster transit time, quicker dispatch from the pier and better and more economical handling in the warehouse and distribution area.

This system will aid our existing customers in keeping their present market or their present source of supply, while at the same time it will permit our customers to expand their markets, to expand their profits and to seek new markets because the unit load system provides a net reduction in overall costs.

Internal handling costs are as important or maybe more important than external handling costs.

The FOIL unit load system in most cases enables the seller to standardize the size of his sales unit into a larger unit. This saves him money and through larger volume purchases the buyer saves money. The buyer can pass this saving on to his customers, thus becoming more competitive. True floor to floor transportation is available.

One of our goals, in the future, is to develop our scheduling and operations to the point where we can load and unload the ship through the side port directly from the truck or train handling the inland haul of the cargo, thus storage on the dock and handling charges could be eliminated or drastically reduced. Another goal is to make the cargo available to the receiver as soon as it is discharged from the ship. I realize that as of today this is not being done. Also I realize that customs regulations, etc., might temporarily be a hindrance, but it is a practical goal.

Through bills of lading, through responsibility, through routing and through rates is another foreseeable goal. A few changes in conference regulations and perhaps some legislative changes would be needed to accomplish this goal, but it is worth any effort that it takes. From the shipper or receivers point of view this would be very efficient as he would have to pay only one rate, he could look to only one firm for liability and the firm issuing the bill of lading would have greater responsibility and thus would of necessity have to do a better job of handling and moving the cargo.

A total transportation system will bring about more efficiency and economy. It includes internal materials handling, warehousing and distribution in addition to the ocean haul.

The major investment in the unit load system is conversion of ships to side ports. We do not have the large capital investment involved in containers, container cranes, container ships, consolidation depots, etc. We do not have the back haul of the empty container, we do not have the expenses of paper work in keeping track of containers, we do not have the extra cost of insurance, we do not have idle capital, idle equipment or equipment interchange problems.

The FOIL unit load system can reduce warehousing costs with faster and more controlled handling. It can reduce inventories, keep goods fresher, turn over money faster and the unit load system eliminates re-handling, re-packing and re-stowing all with less capital tied up than with any other form of transportation that endeavors to be of service to the shippers and receivers of cargo.

Mr. Speaker, we need initiative and progress of the type shown by the development of the unit-load system if we are to meet the demands of world trade and our world population. In 1960 world population was approximately 3 billion persons, by 1980 it is expected to be 4 billion and by 1990 5 billion people. In 1961 U.S. exports were \$20 billion, last year approximately \$30 billion and our U.S. Department of Commerce has projected a figure of \$60 billion in U.S. exports by the year 1975.

Fred. Olsen Interocean Line is to be congratulated for development of this new transportation technique and they are also to be congratulated for using port facilities in my district.

Need for Health Personnel

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1968

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the health manpower shortage is critical. Even with the health legislation enacted in the past years, the need for health personnel is far beyond the present supply.

In his health message to Congress on Monday, the President pointed up the urgent necessity for more nurses to meet our Nation's need. The nursing shortage is a severe problem and one that we must face if we are to meet our responsibility to society.

Last November 28, I introduced legislation calling for establishment of a temporary 5-year program of Federal assistance that will help not only the nursing schools reestablish their financial footing, but also will give limited tuition help to student nurses. This is one step that is in order.

While we may disagree on many issues and the means to achieve our goals, I am confident that we agree that every segment of our society should be able to obtain quality medical care.

The delivery of that medical care, however, depends in large part on a more adequate supply of trained health personnel—health personnel that we do not currently possess in sufficient number.

The need, therefore, is clear. We must increase markedly our supply of health personnel at all levels.

We need highly trained physicians and

nurses, as well as numerous other health workers. We must assume the initiative in this task and work together with all the health groups concerned with the problem. We must make every effort to insure that our society receives the medical services it requires.

The National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders May Have Done an Injustice to the American People

HON. J. HERBERT BURKE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1968

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the report by the President's National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders may have, by its haste in preparation and submission, done an injustice to the American people.

In 7 short months, the Commission rushed ahead to release the report, 4 months ahead of schedule and in the end rehashed much of what the public media had presented the public shortly after the long hot summer of 1967.

Coming from the Commission, the harshest part of the analysis was the savage portrayal of America and its citizens as racists. Our country has been given a blanket indictment. If there are racists in our society and we must admit there are some, we must recognize they exist to some degree in both the Negro and white societies.

In putting forth their program the Commission has offered us proposals that are wornout cliches and tried programs of the past; namely, the pumping of large grants of Federal money into simmering areas. Money alone is not the answer to big city woes.

Also, I might point out that America has done more for its minority groups and ethnic population than any other country in the world. Even the Commission must agree to this statement.

True, there is much to be done in the area of wiping out poverty, not only for the Negroes, but also for the whites. But these problems involve sociological problems and changes that no sum of money can solve.

Congress cannot legislate brotherly love, nor change the mores of society overnight.

The present existing problems cannot be solved by the idealistic, wishful thinking put forth in this Commission report.

The responsibility for a solution to this dilemma must be the result of a sincere and honest approach by both white and Negro alike.

Where some of the fault may lie with white prejudice, we must not lose sight of the fact that the Negro must shoulder part of the blame for his own plight, due to the Negroes' self-indulgence of feeling sorry for himself and attempting as a race to make the white population the whipping boy for injustices brought about by slavery and its aftermath.

The Negro, himself, has been advocating by his militant actions, open revolt, while at the same time asking for more

welfare without indicating his desire to educate himself, clean up his own communities, and to fight crime in his own backyard.

Solutions to these many problems must come from mutual cooperation, and not arm-twisting threats and demands that the dole system be continued and increased at the expense of the American middle-class taxpayer, who is presently carrying the backbreaking burden of supporting today's huge Federal bureaucratic system.

These demands are being made despite the fact that in most instances the white taxpayers of today are descendants of ancestors who never owned slaves. In fact, the majority of many of today's citizens are descendants of those who fled to this country to avoid religious and ethnic persecution themselves.

Before the Congress considers allocating all the requested money for new domestic programs, I feel Congress must demand a review of the present existing programs, with the view in mind that we are presently spending billions of dollars in taxpayers' money for welfare programs, which were not even in existence 5 years ago.

Our domestic programs have increased by huge amounts since 1960, a far bigger increase than the Vietnam war spending.

In the last 5 years, defense spending increased by \$30.2 billion while domestic spending increased at the same time by \$37.5 billion. We must have a total review of these programs, before Congress commits any more money.

It is readily apparent that to solve our urban ills, it is important that we focus in determining a solution to the true needs of the Negro; first, education; second, job security; and third, good housing.

The continuing of the dole system as far as the Negro is concerned is hardly conducive to the argument of the Negro regaining his manhood insofar as family responsibility is concerned. This responsibility carries with it the direct recognition of payment of bills, as incurred and the desire to lift one's self upward rather than pulling more successful persons down through threats and militancy based upon black power.

In a sense then, there must come from the Negro a true desire to come out of the darkness of poverty into the sunshine of prosperity. This the Negro can only accomplish by self-desire and initiative and this must come from the encouragement of their white neighbors. Each of us must do our part. We cannot leave the solution to one group alone.

Miscellaneous Features of the Congressional Reorganization Bills

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1968

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I am placing in the RECORD today several items labeled "Miscellaneous" and listed under part 7 of title IV of the congressional

reorganization bills included in our task force comparison:

PART 7—MISCELLANEOUS

Reid only—Sections 471–479, new Part 7: Disclosure of Gifts, Income, Certain Financial Interests, and Clerk-hire by Members of Congress

Section 471. Definitions. Candidates for Senate and House, whether or not elected, are included in these provisions.

Section 472. Each Senator and Congressman must file with the Secretary of the Senate or Clerk of the House, and with the Joint Committee on Ethics and Conduct (see under "Ethics," Title I), within 15 days after Dec. 31 and June 30 each year, a statement reporting the name, profession, a brief description of duties, the geographical location where duties are principally performed, the relationship, if any, to any Senator, Congressman, or officer or employee of the legislative branch, and total salary of each individual employed by the Senator or Congressman and paid by the House or Senate during the period covered by such statement. Such information shall also be sent to one or more principal newspapers in the District, or to 3 or more such newspapers in the State in the case of Senators.

Section 473. Each Senator, Representative, and each officer or employee of the legislative branch who is compensated at a rate in excess of \$15,000 a year must file with the Secretary of the Senate or Clerk of the House and with the Joint Committee on Ethics, by Jan. 31 each year, a statement disclosing gifts of money or things of value, including the discharge of indebtedness, except campaign contributions (see definition of "contribution," Section 471(b)), received and accepted by him, his spouse or minor child, in an aggregate amount of \$100 or more.

Members and employees of Congress defined above must also report fees and honorariums received during such period.

Section 474. Similarly, Members and employees defined above must report each year names of corporations, etc. in which they and/or their spouses and minor children have financial interests in the value of more than \$2,500, names of certain creditors, certain interests in real property. As in Section 473, this information is to be sent to newspapers.

Section 475. Deals with legal and consulting fees, partnership income, etc.

Sections 476, 477, and 478 prescribe standard forms, provide for the keeping of records, etc.

Section 479 provides a penalty for violation of not more than \$1,000 or imprisonment of not more than 1 year, or both.

Section 481. Stationery allowances of Senators and Representatives

S. 355. Provides that stationery allowances of Senators and Representatives shall be available only for stationery and other office supplies for official business use in the Washington, state, and district offices. Any portion of any allowance not used for this purpose shall revert to the general fund of the Treasury at the end of the period for which it was available.

Bolling. Same. (Sec. 471 in Bolling.)

Reid. Same.

Print No. 3. Deleted.

(NOTE.—This is a new section, added by adoption of an amendment (No. 119) offered by Senators Williams (Del.) and Ellender. The vote was roll call, 59–18. See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 113, Pt. 4, pp. 5551–5556.)

Bolling and Reid only—Oral and written communications with the executive branch departments, bureaus, and agencies

Sections 481 and 482 of the Bolling and Reid bills, respectively, require that Members' written and oral communications to execute agencies, departments, etc., upon a matter pending before such agency, shall be made part of the public record of the pro-

ceedings on that matter. Oral communications shall be reduced to writing by the agency and a copy sent to the Member involved.

Bolling and Reid only—"Jefferson's Rule"

Sections 491 and 483 of the Bolling and Reid bills, respectively, would include "Jefferson's Rule" (see paragraph 376, House Manual) re private interests of Members in voting as a part of House Rule VIII. The wording to be added to Rule VIII is as follows: "Where the private interests of a Member are concerned in a bill or question, he is to withdraw. A fundamental principle is that a man should not be judge in his own cause. Therefore, it is for the honor of the House that this rule of immemorial observance should be strictly adhered to."

Reid only—Private notice questions

SEC. 484 of Reid's bill would add the following language to House Rule XIV:

"The Speaker may recognize the Secretaries of the executive departments and they may be admitted to the floor of the House at any time, for the purpose of answering questions submitted previously by a Member of the House of Representatives and supplementary questions. The relevant Secretaries will be so recognized at least twice a month when such private notice questions have been submitted. Sessions of the House at which private notice questions are being answered may be televised at the discretion of a majority of the Members present and voting."

Seeking Justice From the Federal Government

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1968

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, for some time now I have dealt rather extensively with the many ramifications of the Otto Otepka case in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The security aspects of this case are the most widely known, but its applicability to civil service employees, in general, needs to be better appreciated. Since late 1963, Otepka has been engaged in a monumental battle with officials in the State Department in which just about every underhanded device has been used to get this hard-nosed security officer out of the State Department. Now, over 4 years later Otepka is seeking relief through civil service procedures. Other Federal employees with less tenacity would have left Government service long ago.

Now comes another case in which a lone citizen has been fighting the Government for some time to right an alleged wrong. In today's Washington Star, Joseph Young, the Star's able columnist on the Federal scene, brings to light the case of a scientist with the Air Force who was retired on grounds of mental disability. Mr. Young begins his tale in this manner:

This is a column we've put off writing for a long time.

We hoped we wouldn't have to write it. We hoped that things would be righted so that a column would be unnecessary.

*Listed as "Private interests of Members" in Bolling Table of Contents; as "Voting by Members of the House" in Reid Table of Contents.

But nothing has happened and an apparent injustice remains uncorrected.

As in the Otepka case, the scientist has been forced to use his own funds to advance his case while the taxpayers' dollars pay the bills for the Government side.

Also included in Mr. Young's column is a reference to the Otepka case. It reports that the State Department is getting some heat from Congress on their utilization of qualified manpower and that possible reduction in both State's appropriation and personnel might be in the offing.

I request that the March 7 column of the Federal Spotlight by Joseph Young of the Washington Star be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

IS MENTALITY DISABILITY RETIREMENT USED AS A WEAPON BY AGENCIES?

(By Joseph Young)

This is a column we've put off writing for a long time.

We hoped we wouldn't have to write it. We hoped that things would be righted so that a column would be unnecessary.

The situation involves one government employee, but under circumstances that could involve other federal workers tomorrow or the next day. Similar cases have occurred in the past.

The person is an Air Force scientist, a man with a fine record and reputation. That is, a fine record and reputation prior to the Air Force's action more than a year ago in retiring him involuntarily on charges of mental disability.

The scientist, who was employed at an Air Force base in the Southwest, incurred the wrath of his military superiors when he refused to sign a report attesting to the accuracy of a military scientific project. He felt that the report was inaccurate and that he would be doing a disservice to his country if he signed it.

Retaliation was swift. First, he was refused his periodic in-grade pay raise. Then, his security clearance was canceled. Finally, he was retired on ground of mental disability.

Most employees would have accepted the inevitable. But the scientist, determined to fight for vindication, withdrew all of his limited savings and came to Washington nearly a year ago to seek justice. He still seeks justice, but his savings have been just about depleted.

He has enlisted the aid of Sen. Sam Ervin, D-N.C., chairman of the Senate Constitutional Rights subcommittee, and Sen. Clinton Anderson, D-N.M. Senate investigators, convinced that the scientist is not mentally unbalanced, have held endless meetings with the Air Force and Civil Service Commission, but thus far to no avail.

In government, the cardinal sin appears to be to admit a mistake, and no one in Air Force or the CSC wants to break this tradition.

Apparently the most serious finding that Air Force psychiatrists could make against the scientist is that 'he is hard to get along with.'

That the scientist may be stubborn and occasionally difficult to work with, he is the first to admit. But he also feels he has to retain his integrity as a scientist and his sense of obligation to the taxpayers who pay his salary. Does this make a man mentally unstable?

The late President Kennedy advocated and encouraged the right of government employees to dissent. President Johnson has reiterated this view.

But who in government will speak out against what they see is wrong if they are to suffer the same fate as the Air Force scientist—dismissal from the service and denial

of the chance of gainful employment for the rest of his life. Because with the stigma of a mental disability discharge, who in industry, let alone government, will hire such a person?

President Johnson could strike a mighty blow for justice and increased morale in government if he would personally intercede in the case of the Air Force scientist and insist that justice prevail.

Stormy seas at State—State Department faces cuts in its budget which could reduce its number of jobs and also trim its operating expenses.

It's reported that members of the House Appropriations subcommittee during hearings on the State Department's money bill gave department officials a rough time when they testified.

The subcommittee members reportedly were angered over such things as the handling of the Otto Otepka case as well as two other employees who were given little or nothing to do because of their support of him; alleged lax security and other mismanagement practices attributed to the department, and the alleged employment of homo-sexuals in the department.

Also likely to be affected by all this is the Agency for International Development, as well as Central Intelligence Agency and the National Security Agency.

Resolution on Railroad Finances

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1968

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, by resolution adopted at its recent convention, the AFL-CIO urges Congress to make a thorough investigation of all aspects of the financing and ownership of the Nation's railroads. Since Congress is charged with much of the responsibility of shaping policies that assure full protection of the public's interest in this vital transportation network, the AFL-CIO proposal is particularly pertinent to the business of this House.

With unanimous consent, I now offer for reprinting at this point in the RECORD that AFL-CIO convention resolution, and recommend it to the consideration of all of my colleagues.

The resolution is as follows:

RESOLUTION 18—RAILROAD FINANCES

Whereas, Important public decisions affecting railroad rates, taxation, public aid, mergers, service and other matters are based in substantial part on statements by railroad management about their companies' financial situation, and

Whereas, Public policy has long and rightly required full public disclosure of the ownership of the railroad industry but this policy has been frustrated by the widespread practice of listing railroad stock ownership as anonymous accounts in Swiss banks and under so-called "street" names, and

Whereas, The true financial situation of the railroads is further confused and obscured by complex, dubious and differing railroad accounting procedures prescribed by government agencies, and

Whereas, Accurate facts about the finances of this major public service industry are vitally needed in order to shape proper public policies and public understanding; therefore, be it

Resolved: That the AFL-CIO asks Congress to undertake a thorough and complete investigation of railroad corporation finances,

bookkeeping procedures, ownership and control, to dispel the mystery surrounding this subject, and be it further

Resolved: That the AFL-CIO urges that independent outside accountants be retained jointly by the Internal Revenue Service and the Interstate Commerce Commission to study railroad accounting procedures for tax and regulatory purposes, together with their effect on reported railroad profits, in order that these procedures and statements be brought into line with accounting practices in other industries.

Referred to Committee on Resolutions.

Meeds Praises Washington State Entry in Voice of Democracy Contest

HON. LLOYD MEEDS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1968

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and their ladies auxiliary conduct a Voice of Democracy contest, for which all high school students are eligible to compete. The competition is in the form of a speaking contest on some aspect of democracy, and the prizes are high college scholarships.

This year's topic is "Freedom's Challenge."

Kathy Baskins, of Port Angeles, Wash., won the Washington State contest and will be representing my great State in this year's national competition, being held in the District of Columbia on March 12.

We of the Evergreen State and especially the Second Congressional District, are particularly proud of her.

I insert her speech in the RECORD today, Mr. Speaker, as a refutation to those who believe that there is no show of promise or cause for hope in the younger generation. I also hold Kathy's speech up to other members of her generation as a guide to what is valuable in our society and what deserving work lies ahead for them.

The speech follows:

A UNITED GENERATION

Over 200 years ago a patriot urging the people of a newly formed republic to unite together said:

"Then join hand in hand brave Americans all; by uniting we stand by dividing we fall."

These people came to this country seeking freedom—freedom of speech—freedom of religion—and most of all freedom from tyranny. And they won their freedom by meeting a challenge, and by winning secured for future generations the blessings of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

But what is happening today to the generation that these rights were bestowed upon? Are they still uniting together to fight for the freedoms that our ancestors fought for? Or is this generation turning into an apathetic society; procrastinating the responsibilities bequeathed upon them by their forefathers; the responsibilities necessary to meet freedom's challenge?

Every day we Americans are faced with challenges that jeopardize our freedom: rioters, draft-card burners, and their counterparts, all challenging our freedoms and dividing our society by abusing the same freedoms that they refuse to fight for. And what does the average citizen do? Practically

nothing, but allow himself to become a member in an apathetic world. A dream-world built up of excuses and alibis:

"I can't do anything about it." "I'm too busy to vote." "Why get involved, it doesn't concern me!"

What would have happened to the war ravaged island of England a little over 25 years ago when it was faced by the cruel oppression of Nazi Germany if its citizens would have taken these attitudes? But they did not. They united to the words of Sir Winston Churchill,

"... we shall fight on the beaches, we shall fight on the landing grounds, we shall fight in the fields and in the streets, we shall fight in the hills; we shall never surrender."

And surrender they did not! They met freedom's challenge and won! If our country is to remain what countless numbers have died for it to be we must follow the example of the English; united we must stand.

We, the youth of America, can't afford to let our generation be the last one known as one of free individuals. We have to acknowledge our responsibilities as Americans now... today... not tomorrow or next week; for then it may be too late. In the words of the late President John F. Kennedy our challenge is clearly stated:

"Now the trumpet summons us again—not as a call to bear arms, though arms we need—not as a call to battle, though embattled we are—but a call to bear the burden of a long twilight struggle year in and year out... a struggle against the common enemies of man; tyranny, poverty, disease, and war itself."

We have to meet the challenge before us. And that challenge is everywhere: not only in the swamps and jungles of Viet Nam but also in the slums of Chicago and Detroit; on our local college campuses; and in the minds of anti-Americans walking our city streets.

But the challenge can't be met by apathetic ways. Our generation must work to achieve higher and better goals to strengthen the framework of our country. We must become better educated, striving onward to the challenging new fields open to us in our institutions of higher learning. We must become more alert to the changing world around us; more active in our government system, beginning with the opportunities open to us through participation in our school governments, by participating in these mock governments now we will learn how to act as responsible citizens when the time comes. We must become stronger both physically as well as spiritually; through hard work and a belief in the God that created us. Yet, even with all of these traits our generation could lose freedoms challenge through the lack of one essential element... unity. We must learn to unite as have Americans before us and by following their examples support the freedoms that keep our country strong.

Only then can we be assured that our generation has successfully met the challenge of freedom. And only then will we know the true meaning of the statement made by William Harvard:

"The greatest glory of a freeborn people is to transmit that freedom to their children."

And I ask you, what greater gift has ever been given to any people than the gift of freedom?

In Pursuit of Peace

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1968

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday in the House—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 5434—I addressed my colleagues on the

Vietnam war, calling for an all-out diplomatic offensive to explore all avenues to peace—avenues which to this date have not been fully explored, or tested.

Among the proposals to which I referred was my seven-point peace proposal of August 1966 which I am today repeating in revised and updated form.

I proposed then and I repeat now that as a courageous and dramatic step to move the Vietnam war from the battlefield to the conference table, our President should announce to the world that he has—

First. Set the date, fixed the time, and appointed the place for a peace conference on Vietnam.

Second. Sent invitations to North Vietnam, South Vietnam, the National Liberation Front and all combatants to participate;

Third. Agreed that as further evidence of our peaceful intentions, we will cease aerial bombings in North Vietnam, pending the appearance of Hanoi at the peace table;

Fourth. Agreed that 72 hours after the conference starts, there shall be a reciprocal cease-fire coupled with a cessation of all movement of troops and materiel while negotiations are being carried on in good faith. Provisions for removal of the sick and wounded and movement of food, clothing, and medical supplies, under appropriate inspection and supervision shall be made;

Fifth. Agreed that if the third and fourth items above have been complied with then, 48 hours after the cease-fire, the Secretary of State will be present at the negotiations to meet with his counterparts of the other nations invited to the conference;

Sixth. Agreed that the agenda to be mutually agreed upon may include the 14 points of the United States, the four points of the Hanoi government, the Geneva agreements of 1954 and 1962, and such other items which the parties may by mutual agreement add;

Seventh. Extended an invitation to the cochairmen of the Geneva Conference—the Soviet Union, and Great Britain—to the members of the International Control Commission—India, Canada, and Poland—and to the Secretary General of the United Nations to take part in the conference.

The President, by making these proposals will have announced to the world and to our concerned citizens that the United States not only has the sincere desire, but also the determination to pursue peace, and that our Government wants to see all killing and destruction stopped. By adopting these proposals the President will have seized the initiative and demonstrated to the world the full measure of our continuing efforts to achieve a peaceful settlement.

In my letter to the President I stated:

Mr. President, you now have an excellent opportunity for creative diplomacy and dynamic statesmanship.

Let us hope and pray that North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front will recognize our good intentions and come to the peace table.

If they do, both sides will have gained much.

Should they fail to appear, let the eyes of the world behold the empty chairs and let

the ears of the world hear the thunder of the silence from those invited—but unrepresented at the peace table.

Industrial Revenue Bonds' Tax-Free Status Is To End on March 15 Under Treasury Plan

HON. SPEEDY O. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1968

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the Wall Street Journal today published an account of the efforts by the Internal Revenue Service to end by March 15 the tax-exempt status of State and municipal industrial development bonds, a tax exemption which has been in effect since 1954. In its conclusion, the Wall Street Journal noted that this "action will be welcomed by municipal officials and by the investment community," because the companies will, in their view, proceed to build plants which were to be municipally financed.

I disagree completely with this view of the unidentified "Government men." The Louisiana Department of Commerce and Industry disagrees, and I have no doubt that most municipal officials affected by this ruling will disagree. The fact is that the ruling will effectively destroy the job-producing economic development programs in at least 43 of the 50 States of the Union, and especially in the rural, job-starved areas of the Nation. Such a drastic move should, in my opinion and in the opinion of business and government in Louisiana, be addressed to the deliberations of the Congress.

For the information of Members who may not have seen the article, I include in the RECORD at this point the Wall Street Journal story, "Industrial Revenue Bonds' Tax-Free Status Is To End on March 15 Under Treasury Plan":

INDUSTRIAL REVENUE BONDS' TAX-FREE STATUS IS TO END ON MARCH 15 UNDER TREASURY PLAN

WASHINGTON.—The Treasury said it will propose a regulation around March 15 to end the exemption from Federal income taxes of interest on industrial revenue bonds.

While the regulation is pending, the department's Internal Revenue Service said, it will no longer issue letters ruling on the tax status of individual issues. However, the IRS said, ruling requests received before the close of business yesterday will be processed. But those involving "mandatory redemption" features, it added, won't be eligible to receive ruling letters.

Industrial revenue bonds are issued by municipalities to finance construction of factories. The bonds are repaid through rental or lease revenue from the business that uses the facility. The practice allows lower interest costs than corporations would have to pay if they issued their own taxable securities.

The mandatory redemption features are a relatively new development; they require the company to redeem the bonds if laws or regulations are changed to make the interest taxable.

ISSUES AFFECTED

The new Treasury proposal would apply only to industrial revenue bonds sold after March 15, the IRS said. It added that bonds would be considered sold "on the date a

buyer or underwriter enters into a binding contract with the issuer to purchase the bonds at a fixed price."

In its announcement late last evening, in "Technical Information Release 972," the IRS said it is "reconsidering its position" on the tax exemption of municipal bonds on which "the debtor, in reality, is a private corporation." The IRS had ruled in 1954 that the industrial revenue bonds were tax exempt.

The doubtless-controversial step is to be subject to a public hearing, in about 30 or 45 days, after which the agency will take final action.

Stanley S. Surrey, assistant Treasury secretary for tax policy, said the Government will have to decide the tax status of a few issues already outstanding that have the mandatory redemption features. Current Treasury rulings don't deal with such provisions because they didn't exist until very recently and the issuers haven't sought specific rulings on them. And, Mr. Surrey explained, those with requests pending at the IRS for rulings on such issues will have to amend them to remove the redemption feature "if they want a favorable ruling in a hurry."

The amount of new industrial revenue issues has risen to more than \$1 billion in 1967 from only \$70 million in 1960 and the Treasury objects to the loss of revenue.

BILLS BOGGED DOWN

While the Treasury had been hoping for legislation to end the tax-exempt status, the bills weren't making any headway and issuance of such securities was starting to surge.

At the same time the Securities and Exchange Commission was questioning whether the bonds are truly obligations of municipalities or of private business, local government officials were expressing fear of having to pay higher rates to sell ordinary municipal securities because of competition from industrial-revenue issues. And Treasury officials more or less openly discussed the problem just before the weekend at the National Governor's Conference here. The combined forces prompted a rush of work over the weekend, it's understood, which culminated in last night's announcement.

Generally, Government men believe that the action will be welcomed by municipal officials and by the investment community. Indications are, they say, that companies will proceed with plants that were to have been municipally financed.

Federal Interest in Radiation

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1968

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, one of our distinguished colleagues, Representative CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR., of Ohio, and a member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, has demonstrated keen interest and awareness of the problem of radiation from electronic products.

Recently, Mr. BROWN had occasion to address a Laser Safety Conference at the University of Cincinnati, in Cincinnati, Ohio, where he stressed the problems in radiation control.

At this point in the RECORD, I insert the text of Mr. BROWN's address which I am sure will be of interest to my colleagues:

FEDERAL INTEREST IN RADIATION CONTROL

(A speech by Representative CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR., to a Laser Safety Conference, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio, January 29, 1968)

After 70 years of experience, we simply do not know as much about the effects of ionizing radiation as we should. And this is true in spite of flurries of national or worldwide concern related to presumed hazards from the fluoroscopy of shoe-fittings, atmospheric radiation from atomic explosions or the possibility that we may be absorbing too much radiation from the late late show on our color television set.

The immediate effects of radiation can be dramatic as we watch atomic explosions evaporate the landscape or microwaves cook a meal in seconds, or lasers tunnel through a tiny diamond or a hillside. But little thought is given to the possibilities of danger from the unseen and unfelt cumulative effects of limited exposures from a wide variety of possible sources. After all, dental and medical x-ray machines are tools of the healing arts. Laser sets can be obtained through the mail to stimulate the budding high school scientist. And who would think the nation's greatest manufacturing companies would manufacture a household item that might be hazardous to health.

And yet one scientist, Dr. Karl Z. Morgan, has estimated annual deaths in the United States from radiation causes at between 2,000 and 29,000. While this statistic presented before a Congressional Committee in testimony on the "Radiation Control for Health and Safety Act of 1967" is certainly controversial, it points up the fact that there is much we do not know about the effects of radiation.

The present controls on radiation are similarly obscure or confused. Radioisotopes, made in a nuclear reactor, are the responsibility of the federal government or some states which have taken up this responsibility under the provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954. But radioisotopes made with an accelerator are not subject to federal jurisdiction. A product made with natural radium is only within the jurisdiction of some states; and it can be shipped with no controls in interstate commerce from its point of origin in a state which has no controls.

Senator Bartlett of Alaska has pointed out that the U.S. Department of Agriculture has issued regulations which govern the amount of ionizing radiation which can be applied to a side of bacon for food preservation, but the Public Health Service cannot specify how much radiation may be received by a human being whether it be in diagnosis or treatment for illness, in his occupation or in his casual visit to public or private places.

The Director of the National Center for Radiological Health, which came into being within the Public Health Service last January 1, noted in testimony before Congress on my bill, that non-medical applications of radiation have been growing apace. He estimated there are now 150 particle accelerators, 150 neutron generators, 300 Van deGraff accelerators and 10,000 industrial x-ray machines now in use in industry, training and research. In the past five years, approximately 8,000 x-ray tubes have been sold for non-medical equipment, and the sales of industrial x-ray equipment is increasing at the rate of about ten percent per year. About 20,000 people use this equipment and may be exposed in their occupations. And, based on spot checks by federal and state health agencies, at least a third of these people are not instrumented properly to detect radiation exposure dangers.

But the bulk of x-ray usage in our nation is still in the health field. This is where 75 to 90 percent of all exposures occur and the rate of medical and dental exposure is doubling every 13 years at the present rate.

Of the 173 million x-ray examinations in 1964, 105 million were radiographic examina-

tions, 54 million were dental examinations; ten million were fluoroscopic examinations; and over three million were x-ray treatments.

Of 93 million medical examinations, only 58 percent were performed in hospitals; only 92 percent of these were done in accredited facilities; and only 60 percent of these (or 30 million) were performed under the supervision of a radiologist. Thirty percent were performed by equipment over ten years old and about half exposed more of the patient's body than was required.

This, then, begins to establish the dimension of the problem. When the new field of laser and maser technology is added. With its great potential growth, we see that any need we have now is unlikely to diminish.

My own interest in the question of radiation exposure and health goes back to my interest in leukemia, the disease which claimed the life of our first child. While the cause of this always-fatal blood disease is still undetermined, x-radiation has been implicated as a factor. No one knows whether it is a primary causal factor or something that reduces immunity to some other causal factor. My wife and I both wonder about that pre-natal x-ray—at least to the extent that she has never had another with three subsequent children.

And then, since I have been in Congress, another personal experience brought the question of patient over-exposure to mind once again. Within one day I had a dental examination, which included a full dental X-ray, and a thorough physical examination, which obliged me to have work done by an agency of the government at two different locations. A chest X-ray was taken at the first location and suggested at the second merely to avoid the inconvenience of having to send for the first set of X-rays. That I had not long before participated in a public service chest X-ray program was not considered significant from the standpoint of X-radiation exposure. No one seemed to care how many recent X-rays I had had.

Although we know the dangers of Hiroshima and the damage done to careless radiologists, doctors and dentists who have developed cancers or fathered malformed children; and though we have recognized the health risks of uranium mining or painting radium dials on watches, we have not fully recognized or dealt with the problem of radiation hazards.

As is so often the case, private scientific and professional groups were first to become concerned about this problem and have been studying or at least observing it for many years. They took the initiative early in recommending standards for use.

But as of 1966, the Public Health Service reports only 42 States had adopted any legislation for radiation protection. And, though 39 have regulatory programs, 22 States still have no specific radiation exposure standards.

These State interests in radiation dangers and controls have been growing since the dangers were first recognized. But Federal interest has mushroomed (if that is not a bad pun) since the Atomic Energy Act.

However, the National Bureau of Standards of the Department of Commerce has maintained an interest in radiological problems for over 30 years, providing the public with X-ray instrument calibration and research in X-ray measurements.

The Department of Agriculture has been interested, as noted previously, in the standards for the use of gamma radiation in food preservation, but the regulations do not concern themselves with the hazards to the operators of irradiating machinery.

The Department of Interior, through the Mine Safety Act, has been given authority to regulate health and safety factors in mines and thereby develops control standards in that aspect of radiation.

The Department of Health, Education, and

Welfare also takes an interest and a hand in standards and regulations through its authority to administer Federal grants to hospitals and public health agencies.

And the Department of Transportation, with its interest in safety; and the Department of Labor, with its concern about working conditions also play their roles.

But most all of these have grown from the interest and knowledge of the Atomic Energy Commission.

In 1959 President Eisenhower established by Executive order the Federal Radiation Council which was later given statutory support in the Congress. Made up of persons from the various departments in the Government which are interested in radiation, its job was to make recommendations to the President for Government-wide regulations or actions in radiation matters.

And so the interest and activity in radiation hazards and controls has grown in both the public and private sectors—usually to mutual advantage and not infrequently hand-in-hand.

I might point out that the Atomic Energy Act, when it was enacted in the mid-forties, was an experiment in itself. The potential of atomic energy was unknown, the effects on the general public were unknown, the hazards had only been suggested at that point. The radiation control measure I have been asked to discuss, is, in the same sense, a legislative experiment.

As defined by Surgeon General Dr. William H. Stewart, the health needs of the American people can be basically identified as: Health Care—to keep people well and to treat them when they are ill or injured; and Health Protection—to protect individuals and communities against disease, injury and environmental hazards.

The Federal Government, over the years, has played a growing role in supporting and augmenting the efforts of the many partners involved in the health system in our country—both health care and health protection. The partnership is composed of the private physician, hospitals and nursing homes, medical centers and biomedical research laboratories, voluntary health agencies, and Government agencies at the Federal, State and local levels.

As a cosponsor of this conference, the Public Health Service directly represents the Federal interest in our health system. To quote from the historic Partnership For Health legislation passed originally in 1966 and updated and expanded through my committee in the recent session of Congress, the Public Health Service is dedicated to "promoting and assuring the highest level of health attainable for every person in an environment which contributes positively to healthful individual and family living." This is the essence of the Federal interest.

The Federal end of the partnership is supported by tax dollars in multibillion dollar amounts annually. The new National Center for Radiological Health, as one of many Federal, State, and local authorities dispensing these funds, has been appropriated nearly \$16 million for its fiscal 1968 budget typical of the increasing amount of resources which have been devoted to diminishing the hazard to health of radiation.

Surgeon General Stewart has pointed out in testimony before Congress that, for some of the other radiations, such as microwaves or lasers, which are neither adequately studied nor controlled, there is now sufficient evidence of dangers to indicate that exposure should be controlled. For other sources, we do not know enough about the radiation they may be emitting or the number of people being exposed to make a judgment at this time.

So, if the Federal Government is to keep faith with its responsibility, it must assure that radiation exposure in the environment is kept at the lowest possible level while, at the same time encouraging and assisting the development of the science and technology.

To meet the first part of this responsibility, the Congress is considering several similar bills to help reduce exposure to electromagnetic radiations from electronic products. There are a number of identical bills in the House, of which mine, H.R. 12125, is one. It is the same as S. 2067, in the Senate.

These bills define radiation as meaning any electromagnetic radiation, including but not limited to ionizing radiation, and any sound radiation which can be generated during the operation of electronic products or devices. So you see that, while products are not specifically mentioned by type or category in the legislation, the study of nonionizing radiation sources, such as ultra-high-frequency radio waves, microwaves and lasers is included.

Let me return to the fact that some injurious effects of exposure to microwaves and lasers are now known. We know that overexposure can injure individuals. Whether overexposure can affect the genetic quality of populations does not seem established one way or the other, although some observations may indicate a genetic effect from microwaves.

Whether there are other hazards will have to be determined by study and research. At the moment the situation is not critical, for most applications of the more powerful microwave and laser units are in Government operation and thus are now under direct control. But microwave and laser technology is literally pouring from our laboratories and very powerful units are in the offing for private and military applications, so that the chances of exposure are increasing both in number and amount of exposure.

Subsequent tests revealed that some of the questionable tubes were emitting X-rays at a level 200,000 times greater than accepted recommended rates.

At this point it was obvious that existing protective standards for consumer products were not being enforced and measures were demanded that would offer some degree of control or regulation. Preventative medicine, if you will, was called for.

As tests continued, the legislative process was geared up. Support was offered by a number of Congressmen who recognized the need for a comprehensive study of radiation hazards as related to all electronic products. The companion measure to the House bills was introduced in the Senate by Senator Bartlett of Alaska who had expressed an earlier interest in radioactive fallout in his State and in the Arctic.

In an effort to prepare ourselves to act on the proposed legislation, hearings in both the House and Senate were conducted during which expert witnesses from both private and public sectors were invited to testify. In the course of the hearings, statements were offered by some 40 interested parties.

Although the hearings centered around hazards from ionizing radiation, the gamut of electronic products was discussed, including lasers. While hearings are not completed, at least on the Senate side, the testimony thus far has been favorable to the proposed legislation.

The Radiation Control for Health and Safety Act proposes a comprehensive scheme wherein the Federal Government will exercise solid leadership in the control of radiation for the best interests of the public health and welfare.

In this bill, the Congress declares that the public health and safety must be protected from the dangers of radiation from electronic products. In order to achieve this objective, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall (1) undertake and provide support and assistance for research and investigations relating to the biological effects and control of such radiation hazards; (2) cooperate with public and private organizations for these purposes; and (3) develop and

administer standards for the control of radiation emissions from electronic products.

I have already noted that, by definition, the radiation referred to means any electromagnetic radiation, including but not limited to ionizing radiation, and any sound radiation which can be generated during the operation of all electronic products or devices. Thus, it includes lasers.

The bill is rather specific in directing how the Secretary shall go about meeting the challenge posed in the mandate I have just mentioned.

It proposes that the agency shall set up a research program designed to minimize radiations emanating from electronic products and to minimize exposure of people to such radiations. In the course of its work the governmental agency is directed to maintain liaison with industry and interested organizations in the interest of a two-way flow of information on present and future potential radiation emissions from electronic products.

The bill further requires that the (appropriate) agency study and evaluate emissions and conditions of exposure to such radiations in relation to epidemiological and bioeffects studies and control activities and then develop, test and evaluate the effectiveness of procedures and techniques for minimizing radiation exposure.

There are included provisions for necessary grants to public and private agencies and institutions and to individuals and nonprofit organizations for research purposes.

The desired end product, as stated in the declaration, is the prescription of standards applicable to the emission of radiation. Once standards are set and disseminated to the respective industries, the agency is responsible for a continuing review and evaluation of testing programs carried out by industry to assure that their products comply with the standards.

Imported products are also covered by the same standards.

It is important to note that the act does not pre-empt or discourage State surveillance and control of radiation from electronic products. The Secretary would be authorized to set up and enforce certain standards, some of them pre-emptive, to govern the manufacture of devices. But he is also empowered and directed to stimulate and encourage the efforts of the States and industry. Perhaps even more important, the Secretary is directed to undertake a long-range, continuing program to inform and educate all State public health personnel about control of radiation.

It is in this general context that some of you may be asked to contribute your knowledge and experience in laser technology.

In our tripartite system of Government, to recall for a moment a bit of basic political science, the Congress and the executive have separate and distinct responsibilities. We in Congress have a responsibility to our constituents and to the Nation to anticipate dangers of an era which Dr. Seaborg of the Atomic Energy Commission persuasively describes as a scientific revolution. And it is in meeting this responsibility that Congress comes to the question of lasers.

Today lasers are confined largely to laboratories where experienced and responsible professional people use them—and even under these conditions accidents happen. But tomorrow lasers may be used by production workers in industry, by miners digging tunnels through mountains, perhaps by chemical or metallurgical process workers, and certainly by our military personnel on a broad front.

And as lasers emerge from the laboratories, as individual units increase in power, as more applications are found for ultra-violet and infra-red lasers which cannot be seen by the human eye, there will be an increasing chance of exposure and an increas-

ing chance of injury to workers and perhaps to the general public.

Several alternatives lie ahead. We can wait until the number and severity of accidents compels hasty action. We can act now to build up the information base that will be required for intelligent regulation later. We can set interim standards now based upon present knowledge.

What Congress finally will do depends in part upon the advice and information that we receive from many of you here today who are working at the forefront of this exciting new field. This legislation, prepared with the guidance of the Public Health Service, has been introduced by a number of concerned Members of Congress on both sides of the political aisle in both the House and Senate. After the hearings in both the House and Senate are completed, the Commerce Committee of the Senate and the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House will each approve its own version of a bill. The bills may be altered from the one I have described to you here as the original proposal. The testimony before the committees may require this, although no major alterations have thus far been indicated.

Then the committee-approved bill must survive the consideration of each branch of the Congress—including the possibility of amendment from the floor. And once passed in the House and in the Senate, any differences between the versions of the bill adopted in each body must be resolved in conference committee by representatives of each original committee. After this compromise conference version is approved by both bodies and signed by the President, the Congress still must appropriate the funds to carry out the program authorized—and currently, money is one of our biggest problems. We seem to have more worthy things on which someone wants to spend money than we have money to spend.

So the bill I have discussed is really only a beginning—and until we can resolve our national financial crisis, it may be a slow beginning. But it is a start. And your participation in it is important, both now and later. When it is enacted into law, your cooperation with the Public Health Service in determination of the studies to be made and the regulations to be set will be vital to the safe development of radiation technology and science. Today, that science is exciting and promising and dangerous. The ambition of this legislation is, insofar as possible, to take the danger out of the future without adversely affecting the excitement, growth or promising advantages.

Resolution Adopted by the Lithuanian American Council of Greater New York

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1968

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on February 18 it was my pleasure to meet with and address the members of the Lithuanian American Council of Greater New York on the observance of the 50th anniversary of Lithuanian independence.

This gathering of loyal American citizens of Lithuanian birth or ancestry adopted the following resolution in support of their oppressed brothers and sisters under Soviet domination:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY LITHUANIAN RALLY ON FEBRUARY 18, 1968

We, Lithuanian Americans of Greater New York, gathered on February 18, 1968 at

Washington Irving High School, New York, N.Y.

To commemorate the 50th Anniversary of the Restoration of the Independence to Lithuania proclaimed on February 16, 1918 in Vilnius, the capital of Lithuania;

And to honor the memory of those Lithuanians who defended their country against foreign oppression with their lives;

Protesting vigorously against the illegal and forcible incorporation of Lithuania by Soviet Russia; and against the genocide and deportation of more than 400,000 Lithuanians, and

Reaffirming the unswerving determination of Lithuanian people everywhere to regain Independence and Freedom for the land of their Fathers, and

Expressing our gratitude to the Government of the United States for its steadfast policy of non-recognition of the situation created in Lithuania by Soviet aggression and for its support of the right of the Lithuanian nation to self-determination resolve—

1. To appeal to the President, the Secretary of State, and the Congress of the United States: to give due course to the Congress Concurrent Resolution No. 416 urging the President of the United States to direct the attention of world opinion at the United Nations, and other appropriate international forums and by such means as he deems appropriate, to the denial of the right of self-determination to the peoples of Lithuania;

2. To urge the Free Europe Radio to extend its Broadcasts to Lithuania;

3. To demand that Soviet Russia withdraw its armed forces and all and every other kind of administrative apparatus from the soil of Lithuania, leaving the Lithuanian peoples to remain the Masters of their own house;

4. To assure the Lithuanian people under Soviet occupation of our absolute determination to labor and make every sacrifice required until Lithuania and its people will become free and independent again;

5. To urge American Lithuanians to support the policy of the United States Government opposing Communist expansion everywhere.

The Alliance for Progress

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1968

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, after 6 years of hard work and dedication to the objectives of the Alliance for Progress, the Latin American people have brought about many important changes. Governments are now working to meet the needs of all of their people, tax reforms have been adopted, and programs in health, education, and agriculture are contributing daily to the well-being of the Latin Americans.

This progress is reward enough for the assistance which we extend to them, but it is always gratifying to find a little unexpected thank you for our efforts. I recently read an editorial in the Panamanian newspaper, *El Dia*, which demonstrates the appreciation of the people of that country for our fine program of development assistance. I would like to share this editorial with my colleagues, and include a translation of the January 31, 1968, article in the *RECORD*, as follows:

The intense work the Alliance for Progress is carrying out in our country by making possible construction of schools, streets, roads, electrification and sewerage, increasing production and stimulating develop-

ment and growth of the country, has earned wide concord among all community sectors.

Men, women and children greet with pleasure and enthusiasm the representatives of this Inter-American organization inspired in the noble ideas established by President Kennedy.

Wright Patman Begins 40th Year in House of Representatives—Makes Small Business Speech

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1968

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, March 4 marked the 40th anniversary of the beginning of the congressional career of our distinguished colleague from the first Congressional District of Texas, the well-known champion of small business, the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN.

As might be expected, at a luncheon honoring him on this date, he responded by making a small business speech—a speech which gave welcome encouragement to the small business investment companies that have provided valuable assistance to thousands of small businessmen seeking equity capital needed for their growth and expansion.

It will be remembered that Representative WRIGHT PATMAN pioneered the passage of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 by hearings and investigations he conducted as chairman of the House Small Business Committee during that year.

Under unanimous consent, I include the address which Chairman PATMAN delivered on March 4, 1968, in the *RECORD*, together with the remarks made by the Honorable Robert C. Moot, SBA Administrator, who presented Congressman PATMAN to his distinguished audience on this occasion:

REMARKS BY ROBERT C. MOOT, ADMINISTRATOR, SBA, INTRODUCING HON. WRIGHT PATMAN, CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, ANNUAL MEETING OF THE NATIONAL SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT COMPANY ADVISORY COUNCIL, MARCH 4, 1968, WASHINGTON, D.C.

We are deeply honored today to have as our luncheon speaker one of this nation's greatest legislators of this or any other time. We are doubly honored because today, March 4, 1968, marks the beginning of the 40th consecutive year in Congress for the Honorable Wright Patman. Congressman Patman has served 20 consecutive terms and is third in seniority of the entire House of Representatives.

Wright Patman's typical constituent is the little man. The Congressman is a champion of the people and especially the small businessman of the country. Throughout his long and illustrious career he has been a leader in developing and passing legislation for small business and was in the forefront in establishing the Small Business Administration. Wright Patman is a past Chairman of the House Select Committee on Small Business and still is a very active member of that Committee. Currently he is Chairman of the important and powerful House Banking and Currency Committee. Ten years ago Chairman Patman led the drive for the passage of the Small Business Investment Company legislation. I am personally very grateful for his willingness to counsel and provide support for this agency

since I became Administrator in August of last year. I can assure you that his counsel and support to me were vital to the passage of the SBIC legislative amendments during this past session.

Ladies and Gentlemen, I give you a great man, the Honorable Wright Patman.

STATEMENT OF HON. WRIGHT PATMAN BEFORE THE SMALL BUSINESS ADVISORY COUNCIL, MARCH 4, 1968

It is indeed an honor to be here today to address the first meeting of the SBIC Advisory Council. With the proper spirit and application, the Advisory Council can go a long way to helping the SBIC industry reach the heights that were originally contemplated for the program.

I would like to take a few minutes to discuss the role of the Advisory Committee and, at the same time, look at the state of the art of the SBIC industry.

This Advisory Council is perhaps faced with one of the most important tasks in the short history of your industry, for SBICs are truly at the proverbial crossroads of their existence.

Your jobs in running your companies in the past have not been easy nor will the job of serving on the Advisory Committee be a soft one. But as the council moves forward, it should do so with the thought of bettering the SBIC program not only for those who own or run companies, but also from the outlook of the small business concern.

If this group takes a realistic view of what has happened in the past and is happening now and will work conscientiously to better the program rather than dwelling on "pie-in-the-sky" ideas, then I have no doubt but that this industry will reach the goals that were set up for it when Congress passed the authorizing legislation in 1958.

The Advisory Council must operate in a two-way system of communications. The Council was not created so that the industry would have a forum for presenting its gripes to the Small Business Administration nor was it set up to seek the overturning or toning down of SBA regulations. There has been far too much of that in the past and this has been one of the main reasons that the program has run into problems over regulations and the interpretation of these regulations. I do not contend that SBA has been faultless in handling some of these situations. However, I have been distressed by the lack of willingness of some in the SBIC industry to accept regulatory change.

Unfortunate precedents were established during previous administrations of the SBA that have perhaps magnified this problem. Long ago, a familiar pattern was established. The agency would issue a regulation, the industry would object and SBA would either rescind or water down the regulatory change. This went on for a number of years in which SBA operated more as a super trade organization than as a regulatory agency. Of course, everyone knows what happened during this period when there was little or no regulation of the industry.

Happily, for the overall industry, that situation no longer exists. We now have men running SBA and the SBIC program who want very much to see this industry grow and prosper but will not shut their eyes at regulatory violations in order to achieve that goal.

There have been a number of major regulatory changes in the industry in the past few years. Before these changes were made, the situation had reached a stage where it could not be corrected by gentle reminders or regulatory niceties. Clearly, major reform was the only answer to the situation if the industry was to be saved. In future years, I am certain that the recent regulatory decisions made by the Small Business Administration, although they may have been harsh, will be credited for the survival of this industry.

In short, regulatory changes were made because they had to be made. I am sure you will recall that when Mr. Bernard Boutin took over at SBA, he had grave doubts about the continuation of your industry. I know that many of you underwent several months of mental anguish waiting to see which course Mr. Boutin would take. Mr. Boutin inherited a sick patient. He could have turned his back on the industry and let it fold, blaming the failures on those who preceded him. Or, he could have undertaken painful but necessary corrective action to cure the patient. This was the course he chose. The SBIC industry has not fully recovered from its ailments. But, with the guidance of Mr. Moot and Mr. Brown and with the assistance of this Advisory Council, I foresee total recovery for the patient.

This is enough about the past. You are interested, I know, in the future of the industry. And, of course, your group is charged with the responsibility of finding solutions to the problems that still exist within the industry. For the next few minutes, I would like to discuss some of those points with you.

I feel that the SBIC industry does not have an adequate barometer for gauging its effectiveness. Too much emphasis has been placed on the price of publicly traded SBIC stock in an attempt to use stock prices as a measuring tool for the performance of SBICs. There are others who feel that the amount of favorable news stories indicate whether or not SBICs are doing their job. Both of these indicators, however, deal only with SBICs as an investment and do not offer a true indication of the actual performance of the SBIC in its relation to the purposes of the Small Business Investment Act.

It is still conceivable, and this has been proven in the past, that an SBIC can be highly profitable without meeting the needs of small business. I would hope that in the coming years the industry will realize that it is not made up solely of publicly-owned companies and that more emphasis will be placed on the job that the SBIC is doing in aiding small business rather than in its gain or loss in the stock market or by measuring the number of favorable column inches received in the press.

One of the aspects of the industry that has long troubled me, as well as others interested in the program, is that of the inactive company. I am not referring to the company that is inactive by chance but rather those that are inactive by choice. A few years back, I asked SBA for the number of companies that were inactive. I was quickly assured that there were only a handful of companies in the inactive category. Later, I asked SBA for a definition of "inactive" so that we could better pinpoint the number of companies that were not making loans. SBA replied that at that time its definition of inactive was a company that had not made a loan for a year and a half. No one, I feel, would argue that companies that had been out of the lending business for more than 18 months were truly inactive. But, the important thing is that the inactive classification should start at a far earlier cutoff point.

SBA recently asked one SBIC to consider the possibility of surrendering its license because the company had made only one investment in six years and this investment was repaid during that period. The company became highly indignant over the thought that it was being classified as an inactive company and contended that during the six year period it had sought numerous investments but had been unable to come up with anything that it considered a good investment. This is not the type of company that we want in the program. Over and over again your industry has been told that this is a program of supplying risk or venture capital. And, we all know that one of the recent problems within the industry has been the definition of venture capital. While it may not be an easy task to write a definition for venture

capital in an air-tight sense, every SBIC has found out the meaning of venture capital when it is stuck with its first lemon.

No one expects you to give your money away but, at the same time, it is not the goal of the program to allow an SBIC to make a few investments and then sit back and see what happens. The SBIC should be operating as a revolving fund and certainly the profitable SBICs conduct their business under this principle. And at the same time, it is not fair for those companies sitting on their hands to gain any advantages from the SBIC program whether it be government funds, tax benefits, or even the right to say that they are a small business investment company.

In spite of past performances, investigations, and publicity, it is an honor and privilege to hold an SBIC license. Therefore, I would hope that this Advisory Council, in conjunction with the Administration, would give serious consideration to the question of inactive companies. In the House committee report and again in the statement of the managers on the recently enacted SBIC bill, language was inserted making it clear that the Congress was disturbed about the problem of the inactive company. It was pointed out that the Congress felt that SBA had the power to deal with these companies but that if the agency felt it would not have all the power it needed, prompt consideration would be given to legislation granting the agency the needed authority. With the words of Congress as your springboard, I hope that a plan can be worked out to correct the inactive company problem. And, if you feel that additional legislation is needed, I promise that it will be given the earliest possible consideration.

During the recent investigations of the McClellan committee, suggestions were raised by your industry that thought should be given to a self-policing type operation similar to that used by the stock exchanges and the National Association of Security Dealers. At that time, quite frankly, there was not a great deal of support for such an idea outside of the industry. There was a feeling that SBICs had been caught with their thumbs in the pie and were not trying to take the easy way out.

But for the most part, that unfortunate chapter of SBIC history is behind us and the program once more is moving forward. Now is the time to consider a program of self-policing—not as a replacement for the agency's supervision, but rather as a complementary addition to the supervision. What better publicity could there be than to tell the financial world that you too as an industry are concerned about questionable SBIC operations. In fact, so concerned that you, as an industry, will take action against those operators before SBA has to move in. In short, don't want for trouble to come to you and then try to beg out of the problem—why not adopt machinery to head off the problem before it strikes?

I would also like to touch base this afternoon with the status of new licenses for the program. I would not be telling you the truth if I said I was happy with the influx of bank-owned companies into the program between the passage of the recent SBIC legislation and the 90-day period before it went into effect. Congressional intention was clear that banks were gaining too much of an operating role in this program.

This is why Congress restricted the amount of ownership that a bank could have in an SBIC and in no case could bank control an SBIC except for existing control situations. I frankly was shocked and dismayed at the number of banks that moved into the program during the 90-day delay.

I sincerely hope that they obtained licenses with the thought of running active and public spirited SBICs and that they are not obtaining these licenses solely as a speculative move with the intent of waiting to see what happens to the program before they move

ahead with any investments. Let me assure you that I will be watching the newly-licensed bank-owned SBICs closer than a farm boy at his first burlesque show and I plan to ask SBA for periodic reports on the operations of these companies.

I am certain that one of the topics you will be discussing during your meetings will be that of taxation. In short, whether or not the SBIC tax program presently before Congress will become law this Session or, in fact, in any Session of Congress. Quite frankly, I would hesitate to make a prediction about the fate of the tax bill. Certainly this is not a year for legislation cutting taxes. But, I hope that your industry is not sitting around waiting to see if the tax bill will be passed but instead is moving forward to make this the best possible program.

In closing, let me say that a well-known educational institution, the school of hard knocks, must have offered its first post graduate course to the SBIC industry. And, those still in the industry have graduated with high honors. But, the worst is behind you. And the only question before the industry now is how high a plateau can be reached. If this council and all of the industry will look forward at the same time taking enough of a backward glance to see that the problems in the past do not recur, then I foresee in the very near future a highly profitable SBIC industry not only from the dollars and cents standpoint, but from the viewpoint of the millions of small businesses throughout our Nation.

Elmira College Girls Hold Bake-In and Produce 12,384 Cookies for Marines in Vietnam

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1968

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, regardless of one's extent of support for our activities in Vietnam, it is inescapable that we have more than a half million American men there, and they deserve our constant thoughts and prayers. The students at Elmira College, Elmira, N.Y., decided to show the 7th Marine Regiment that they are not forgotten by the girls back home. They organized a "bake-in" last weekend which produced more than one thousand dozen cookies to be sent to the marines in Quang Nam, Vietnam with personal notes from the girls. The effort was supported by several local and national industries and by veterans posts.

The great success of this spirited endeavor prompts me to bring it to the attention of my colleagues, for they may wish to suggest a similar project to women's colleges, clubs, and groups in their own congressional districts. I am sure, that everyone in the House joins with me in saying to the girls of Elmira College, Well done.

I enclose a news story about the project from the Elmira Star Gazette of March 2 and the Sunday Telegram of March 3:

[From the Elmira (N.Y.) Star Gazette, Mar. 2, 1968]

ELMIRA COLLEGE'S VIET "BAKE-IN" DRAWS DONATIONS FROM LEGION POST, SEVERAL COMPANIES

Harry B. Bentley American Legion Post 443 of Elmira has donated \$200 to assist Elmira College students in shipping 12,000 cookies from today's "bake-in" to American servicemen in Vietnam.

Cookies will be shipped by parcel air lift, a special service of the U.S. Post Office for packages to Vietnam. Plans to have the cookies shipped by military air transport fell through due to the current shortage of cargo space on military flights to the Far East.

Packed in cartons of 24 dozen each, the shipment will amount to about 45 cartons, each weighing about 28 pounds. Shipping costs will be about \$6.85 a carton.

Arrangements have been made with local post office officials to expedite the shipment from Elmira tonight. They will go by air parcel post to San Francisco—where they will be included in a regular mail air lift direct to Vietnam—and are expected to arrive early next week.

The cookies are being sent to the 7th Marine Regiment, 1st Marine Division, in Quang Nam, Vietnam, which includes several men from the Twin Tiers area.

In addition to the \$200 contribution from the Bentley American Legion Post, several other veterans organizations in the Elmira area have indicated that they will assist in underwriting the shipping costs, according to Lillian Waram, chairman of the bake-in committee.

Expenses for the "bake-in" will be underwritten by national and local firms who have donated supplies for the project, according to Miss Waram.

"We are simply overwhelmed by the enthusiastic response to the bake-in idea," Miss Waram said, "and want to thank everyone who has been so wonderful in assuring its success."

Ingredients for the 12,000 oatmeal-honey cookies has been given by the General Mills Co. of Minneapolis, Minn. Heavy duty shipping cartons—and specially printed boxes for each dozen cookies have been supplied by the F.M. Howell Co., Elmira packaging specialists; and plastic bags for packing the cookies in each box have been donated by the Waight Supply Co. of Elmira.

Elmira Quality Printers has supplied printed note paper to be used for personal notes from EC students to be included with each dozen cookies. The Bond Paper Co. of Elmira donated sealing tape, and the Elmira Pepsi Cola Bottling Co. has contributed 15 cases of Pepsi Cola for refreshments for students working on the bake-in.

[From the Elmira (N.Y.) Sunday Telegram, Mar. 3, 1968]

ON WAY TO VIET ARE 12,384 COOKIES

The talk in the Elmira College dorms Saturday night was about boys. Nothing unusual there.

But the boys aren't just any boys. They were American Marines in Vietnam and the girls were talking about how they'd baked and packed 12,384 cookies for them earlier that day.

They were tired, but their mission was done and elation conquered fatigue.

"We'll do it again. We're still up in the air about it," said Lillian Waram, a freshman from Hamilton, Ont. whose idea to send a dozen cookies to a friend in service spawned the "Bake for the Boys" project.

"All the talk tonight has been about it and how many people helped out," said Cheryl Chittick, a freshman from Orchard Park who was another of the 300 Elmira College students—about a quarter of the school's enrollment—who participated in the bake-in.

The idea had been to send 1,000 dozen freshly baked cookies to the front line troops of the 7th Marine Regiment, 1st Marine Division in Quang Nam, Vietnam.

The project was designed as a person-to-person mission of good will and it was picked up with enthusiasm by students, faculty, college administrators, postal workers, local and national companies and veterans organizations—all of whom contributed in various ways.

There was no consideration given to politics. In fact, some of those who baked the

cookies and helped pack them in the 43 cartons for shipment disagree with present government policy regarding the war.

"We were just sitting around one night awhile ago talking about how comfortable we were here and how uncomfortable those guys must be over there and we decided to do something useful," said Miss Waram.

Between then and Saturday, the project grew like Topsy. Baking actually began on Friday under direction of Mahlon "Bud" Bennett, the college food service director.

Baker Alf Hansen came in at 4:30 a.m. Saturday to start the ovens and begin baking so the packers would have a backlog to work on.

At 4:30 p.m. the last trip was made to the sectional post office where the cookies were transferred to the airport.

"It was the greatest thing I've seen on any college campus," said one college official.

The job may be completed, but the Marines won't likely be forgotten. Some kind of response is expected in the next few weeks, especially since the college girls sent out 1,200 personal notes with the cookies.

Executions in Rhodesia

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1968

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the tragic execution of three Africans by the illegal, minority regime of Ian Smith in Rhodesia is one more flagrant example of its contempt for world opinion.

This action by the Smith regime violates not only the 1961 constitution of Rhodesia, which is still recognized by the rest of the world as the only legitimate one, but also the minority government's own constitution, proclaimed in 1965.

The self-proclaimed "independent government" in Salisbury represents the efforts of less than a quarter of a million people of European descent to preserve their domination over 4 million black Africans. In the words of U.N. Ambassador Arthur Goldberg:

Its legislative enactments and its whole course of conduct have been clearly designed to thwart majority rule and perpetuate racial superiority.

As the New York Times commented in an editorial this morning, the "road to apartheid," chosen by Rhodesia's white rulers, "is not likely to be a road to peace."

The editorial on "Executions in Rhodesia" follows:

EXECUTIONS IN RHODESIA

Rhodesia's white minority rulers have now flaunted in the most dramatic and tragic way their utter indifference to world opinion with the execution of three Africans charged with murder.

Under the Constitution of 1961—the only one recognized by the world—the condemned Africans had the right to appeal their death sentences to the Privy Council in Britain. This right was denied last week by white judges in Salisbury, who have thus become tools of Prime Minister Ian Smith's illegal regime. Even under the Constitution proclaimed by the rebels in 1965, Queen Elizabeth was maintained as head of state and designated specifically as Queen of Rhodesia; yet, the regime and its courts refused to recognize the Queen's reprieve of the Africans.

Mr. Smith had an easy way out. He could have instructed Clifford Dupont, the officer "administering the Government" in the Queen's name, to commute the sentence without reference to the royal reprieve. This would have blurred the constitutional issue. In fact, two Africans reprieved by the Queen in 1966 are still alive in Rhodesia.

It is entirely clear that Mr. Smith was not interested in any such demonstration of humanitarianism. His extremists had demanded the blood of the Africans and that is what he gave them, possibly in the hope that this act would deter others among Rhodesia's African majority of four million from striking at his regime.

Nor was Mr. Smith interested in resumption of negotiations with Britain. In fact this act should persuade most of the doubters that Mr. Smith was never serious about negotiating an honorable settlement with Britain on the basis of the principles he professed.

Rhodesia now seems set, perhaps irrevocably, on the road to republicanism and apartheid. For Rhodesia's 220,000 whites it is not likely to be a road to peace.

Miss Edna Earle Named "Woman of the Year" by Hollywood B'nai B'rith Lodge 11-11

HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1968

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, on April 27 of this year, Hollywood B'nai B'rith Lodge 11-11 will honor Miss Edna Earle, famed Los Angeles restaurateur and philanthropist, as its "Woman of the Year." The honor to be extended to Miss Earle is well deserved and all of us in the Los Angeles community would like the Nation to know of this unusual woman.

Edna Earle is a woman of rare achievement who, while not relinquishing the slightest vestige of femininity, has distinguished herself in a field primarily dominated by men.

In 1950 this petite blonde dynamo turned her back on a promising show business career to take over the operation of a struggling little cafe with the provocative name of "Fog Cutter." Today, due to her great vision, charm, courage, and determination, she has emerged as one of the foremost restaurateurs in the area and her creation has become a mecca for the discriminating diner.

Turning those same marvelous energies to the field of philanthropy, she was honored in 1964 by the City of Hope, famed Duarte, Calif., medical research center, which named her its first "Woman of the Year."

An Edna Earle research fellowship was founded by the City of Hope last year and its holder is Dr. Katherine S. Bao, pediatric cardiologist.

Also in 1966, Miss Earle was cited by the California Assembly and the Los Angeles City Council for her life of outstanding personal achievements and her untiring efforts in service of her fellow man.

I know that the distinguished Members of the House of Representatives join me

and Hollywood B'nai B'rith Lodge 11-11 in praising this fine American for her pioneering spirit and humanitarian ideals.

Call for Better Health Services

HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1968

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of our colleagues the text of an address I am delivering this evening before the Junior League of the City of New York dealing with matters of vital concern to the health needs of our people.

The text follows:

CALL FOR BETTER HEALTH SERVICES

As you know, I have just gone through a congressional election campaign, a peculiar American institution designed not for the enlightenment of the voter but for the education of the candidates. In fact the money we spend on campaigns assumes the character of tuition fees.

I particularly observed that American society, like Gaul is divided into three parts: junior leaguers, senior citizens, and a vast horde of humanity in between, too old to partake of the passions of the junior leaguer and too young to enjoy the solace and the comforts of the aged.

I know whereof I speak, because I fall into that middle group where the pangs of unrequited love dissolve into the pains of middle age spread; where the responsibilities of parenthood become limited principally to those of a banking institution; and where fancies of spring turn lightly to the knowledge that there will be no more snow. In addition, as a politician I am particularly exposed to the ravages of myopia, at the very moment when all the rest of humanity is blessed with hindsight.

Under the circumstances, the Junior League of the City of New York should be congratulated for undertaking this study and conference on the health needs of our people. It may well provide you with an opportunity to determine for yourself whether 'tis nobler to end it all in the spring of life or to suffer the slings and arrows of advancing years.

Indeed by any realistic standards of measurement, the evidence is overpowering that the health needs of our people are in a crisis stage. According to a recent survey published by the Citizens Committee on Children, some 19 million American children subsist at poverty levels, suffering illness, disease and malnutrition. Of some 40 million senior citizens in our Nation, more than two-thirds suffer the ills of poverty in addition to those ills of the mind and body common to the elderly.

Millions of American families are trapped in ghettos by reason of bigotry and additional millions are trapped in slums by reason of poverty. And those who enjoy a greater share of American affluence are faced with hospital costs mounting to astronomical proportions. In 1952, the average patient cost per day in a New York City voluntary hospital was \$24. Ten years later, in 1962, it was \$53. Today it is \$90.

Moreover, our hospital structures, both voluntary and municipal, are in too many cases obsolete and hazardous. They suffer severe shortages in doctors, nurses, and other paramedical personnel. Our State hospitals suffer so acute a shortage of medical personnel that psychiatric treatment of the mentally ill is virtually impossible.

Recently, in my capacity as chairman of

the Joint Legislative Committee on Penal Institutions, I inspected State institutions for the criminally insane and was appalled at the total lack of psychiatric care given the inmates. In any history of man's inhumanity to man, there must be a footnote for the man from Brooklyn, arrested at the age of twenty and charged with the theft of \$5. He was found by the court to be legally insane and thereafter not competent to stand trial. Instead he was sent to Matteawan, a State prison for the criminally insane, where he lived for 67 years, until discharged by death.

Statisticians in the medical field normally look to infant mortality rates as a basic guide to the levels of health standards maintained within a community. The infant mortality rate is a simple statistic which sets forth the number of babies who die from natural causes before their first birthday per 1000 live births. For the United States as a whole the infant mortality rate was 24.7. Among white people the rate was 21.5; among non-whites the rate was 40.3. The non-white infant mortality rate for the United States as a whole is just about double the white rate.

In New York State in 1965, the rate was 23.4, for white people 20.2 and for non-whites, again almost twice as high 39.5.

In our own city, the infant mortality is about 26. In Central Harlem it is more than 40; and it is 45 in Brooklyn's Fort Greene section. Some time ago we urgently called the attention of Mayor Lindsay to the sharp disparity in infant mortality rates among different health districts of our city. Our own studies revealed clearly and conclusively a direct correlation between high infant mortality rates and the absence of pre-natal care.

Accordingly, I recommended to Mayor Lindsay the urgent necessity for establishing mobile clinics for pre-natal care, similar to the mobile clinics we use in the city today for tuberculosis, glaucoma, and diabetes. I understand that the gentlemen who constitute the Health Services Administration had a lengthy conference on this proposal, and came up with the remarkable conclusion that such pre-natal care mobile units were unnecessary.

They informed me that with respect to tuberculosis, glaucoma, and diabetes there was a problem of detection, which they said did not pertain to pregnancy. It is indeed unfortunate that the principal executives of the Health Services Administration are all men befogged by the female mystique. I sympathize with their difficulty because, I too, like all boys was exposed to the female tradition perpetuated by mothers.

We were all taught that girls were made of sugar and spice, and other things nice. In fact it was not until recently, when television reached its maturity as an educational force in our society, that I first learned that girls were made of living girdles, breathing bras, and ice blue secret. The growing boys of this generation will escape this mother complex. The Board of Education is now teaching sex in the kindergarten classes, so that before our children learn how to add and subtract, they will know how we multiply.

The poet once said: "Where ignorance is bliss, it is folly to be wise." I can't help but wonder at times whether we are not engaged in a massive effort to substitute folly for ignorance.

In any event, these men who constitute the health services administration, asserted that pregnancy raised no problems of detection—that a woman knows whether she is pregnant or not. I thought that a proposition worthy of further study. I discovered that the sale of rabbits in the United States is keeping pace with the growth of the gross national product: that the number of rabbits used in the manufacture of rabbits is infinitesimal compared to the number of

rabbits used to determine whether at a given moment of time a particular female is or is not pregnant.

Thus, the assertion that a woman knows when she is pregnant is belied by the facts. Moreover that is but a part of the problem. In 1965, 235 babies were born in New York City to mothers 15 years of age or less, all but 15 to Negro girls. On the assumption that these girls were aware of their pregnancy early in the game, did they know what to do about it?

Family mobility is a clear characteristic of the subculture of poverty. Some of our schools in slum neighborhoods have a one hundred percent turnover in pupil population in the course of a school year. There is no warrant for the assumption that these families, when they move from one ghetto to another, know precisely where the health department clinic is located. Nor are there adequate community resources and facilities to advise these families as to available health and medical services. It is clear to me that we cannot sit idly by while so many families suffer the tragedy of infant deaths.

In light of the urgent need for better health, hospital and medical services, it is remarkable that programs reaching towards such objectives become embroiled in heated controversy. The Congress of the United States unfortunately cut back on Federal appropriations for Medicaid. The Senate of the State of New York adopted a bill making serious inroads upon persons covered and available benefits under the State Medicaid program.

I was a member of the Joint Legislative Committee on Medical Care and Medicaid and hearings before the committee revealed the full sweep of the controversy. The burden of costs and taxpayer complaints were common in upstate communities, although in many cases it was clear that taxpayer complaints about rising government costs, from schools to street lighting, were all lumped in their objections to Medicaid. Administrative problems have been monumental: patients complain about doctors, doctors about patients; doctors, pharmacists and other licensed professionals complain about delays in payment of bills; administrators and professionals are squabbling as to whether prescriptions should be written in generic or trade names.

I am certain that with time and patience many of these irritants will be ironed out. It is also clear to me that we need an extension rather than a narrowing of coverage and services. We have an urgent need to build new hospitals to replace those that have become obsolete; we need new hospitals, clinics and health centers to meet the needs of our changing population as well as the movement of people to newly developed communities. We have an urgent need for more and better nursing homes. A great deal needs to be done in medical research, from pediatrics to geriatrics to psychiatric. Programs must be developed for the training of more doctors, nurses, and medical technicians.

In short, decent medical care for the American people will require the expenditure of billions of dollars, as well as the more effective utilization and mobilization of all our medical resources.

A decent medical program for the American people calls for a more massive attack on our slums, eradication of bigotry and the searing indignities to which it exposes so many of our people, the redevelopment of a new sense of purpose and goals to uproot the malaise, which drives so many of our youngsters to narcotics addiction and rebellion.

These are objectives within our capacity to achieve. We must achieve them if the American way of life is to have content and meaning for all our people.

President Johnson Declares Elderly's Right to Independence

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1968

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson last week distributed the first social security checks with increased 1967 benefits to members of the old folks home in Beaumont, Tex.—and well he should.

Through the efforts of President Johnson—and an enlightened Congress—we have secured the largest, single dollar increase in benefits since the inception of social security over 30 years ago. Today, 24 million Americans find their benefits increased an average of 16 percent—35 percent, including Medicare since 1965.

The new increase now in effect will mean, in President Johnson's words, "more dollars and more dignity" for the elderly, increased security for over 5 million widows and orphans, and a greater opportunity for the young to build up insurance toward retirement.

The Social Security Amendments for 1967 are, as the President put it, "a personal declaration of independence" for Americans because they will help provide freedom from fear.

Our generation owes all the rich blessings it possesses to those who have borne the responsibility in the years past. These senior citizens have earned the right to spend their latter days in security, comfort, and dignity.

We in Congress can be justly proud that with the checks President Johnson distributed last week we have fought for—and won—that sacred right for our elderly.

I insert into the RECORD the President's remarks upon distributing the increased social security benefits at the Schlesinger Old Folks Home in Beaumont, Tex.:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT TO A GROUP OF SENIORS CITIZENS AT THE SCHLESINGER OLD FOLKS HOME, BEAUMONT, TEX., MARCH 1, 1968

Congressman Brooks, Congressman Pickle, Mr. Phillips, Mr. Schlesinger, ladies and gentlemen, and my very dear friends:

Several months ago, at Stanford University, in California, a scientific miracle took place: the researchers there demonstrated their ability to create life in a laboratory. Shortly after the Stanford experiments, a South African heart surgeon transplanted a human heart for the first time.

These were great achievements. One day they may change and improve the lives of millions of our people, just as medical research has improved our lives over the past decades from a life expectancy of 54 years in 1920 to a life expectancy of more than 70 years today. Medical science is going to continue slowly and painstakingly to make all of our lives better lives.

Yet, as all of this medical activity is going on, I couldn't help but think that it is not only scientists and medical researchers who make life better for men and women all over the world.

Men in public life can also make life better—and when they are doing their job right, they do make life better for other people.

So I think it is quite important for us to constantly engage in a little introspection and ask ourselves what are we doing to try to better the lives of others.

When he was 87 years old, a great man in public life, Senator Theodore Francis Green, had this to say about being what is now called a "senior citizen": "Most people say that as you get old you have to give up things. I think you get old because you give up things."

The social miracle that has been happening in our country has allowed tens of millions of older people not to give up things, and not to be afraid of their future. We call that miracle something you never heard of 30 years ago or 50 years ago—we call it "Social Security."

Medicare is a case in point. It is hard to believe that only 2½ years ago, millions of elderly Americans lived in fear of a sudden medical emergency that could wipe out their savings after a lifetime of hard work.

That was what we called social insecurity. The enactment of the Medicare Bill that we got passed in 1965 eliminating that insecurity and eliminated that fear for more than 19 million proud, elderly Americans—nearly 10 percent of the total population of America. Action by public men, by politicians—an amendment to the law—completely changed life in America, and made it better just as surely as the new scientific advances are going to make life better.

Medicare, like the rest of the Social Security system, affected the young as well as the old. A man of 40 years of age benefits from Medicare if his dear, old father or mother who is 70 years old is covered. Otherwise he might have to pay his father's or mother's hospital bills. Medicare to him may mean that he can afford to send his 18-year-old daughter to college. So, again, life has been changed for the better for all of them.

But perhaps the most important change was the change in attitude between father and son and grandson. Medicare meant the end of a great deal of family friction over dollars. The end of that friction has been a blessing in millions of homes in America.

More dollars—more dignity—will be the result of the new Social Security amendments that I signed into law in January of this year.

I am here tonight because tomorrow morning, just a few hours from now—all over this great land we love, in all the 50 States of the Union—those dollars will reach home for the first time.

This new law provides the largest, single dollar increase in benefits since Social Security first started. That means an increase in benefits at an average of 16 percent for 24 million of our elder citizens. It goes up to a new maximum of \$234 per month for a retired couple.

Counting the increases of 1965 and including the dollar value of Medicare, that adds up to a 35 percent increase over what it was 30 months ago. Now, that's not enough as far as I am concerned. I asked the Congress and I recommended to the Congress and I urged the Congress to give us an increase averaging 20 percent. I intend to keep on fighting for that.

Let us think, for a moment, what our lives might be like if we didn't have social insurance.

Not long ago, for many Americans, old age was a real calamity. A man might work until he died—or he could work until he became dependent upon his children.

Today, when an elderly man or woman lives with his son or daughter, it is probably because he wants to live there and not because he has to live there. His Social Security check now is his personal declaration of independence and belongs to him alone.

For a younger man, Social Security gives protection against long illness or disability.

It gives his wife and children protection in the event he dies when he is young. Today, there are 5½ million widows and orphans in this country getting insurance checks—up to a new monthly maximum under this new law that runs as high as \$395 per month. A man earning \$8,000 today—with children aged 2, 4, and 6—knows that if he should die his family would receive some measure of security—about \$90,000 in payments over the course of the years to come.

When I discovered America up in my hills almost 60 years ago, we never heard of anything like that. We never dreamed of anything like that. We couldn't even vision anything like that. But it is here.

Finally, a young man today knows that he is building up insurance toward his own retirement. A young, able worker, starting out today, knows that he and his wife can get a monthly income of at least \$323 a month when he retires.

That is what this new law provides. That is what the young men know they can work toward. That is what the older people know is in store.

Social Security was first started, after I had gone to Washington, by a great American—a man who said the only thing we have to fear is fear itself. That man's name was Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

As we meet here tonight, we see, a third of a century after Franklin Roosevelt started it, that what Social Security really buys is freedom from fear—not just for older Americans, but for younger Americans, too.

This is a proud day for me. It has been a long trip to get here—one that began 33 years ago under Franklin Delano Roosevelt. We are not through yet.

We are continuing to move forward.

The one thing that I want to see as much as I want to see anything else in the world, except peace among all men, is to see in this land that I lead during the time allotted me the most modern miracles that we can produce placed into a good home for elder citizens.

I want it to have the best floors and the best roof. I want it to have the most attractive walls and the best windows. I want it to be the place that can be kept clean—where the water is always hot when you want it and always cold if you need it.

I want it where an elder person can get in his bath without fear of slipping or can get out of his bed without fear of breaking his hip. I want it where his food can be good—and he can have a good bed to sleep on, a good room to eat in, and a good place to spend his last days.

I am trying so hard to have a group produce a model home.

I have looked at what you have here. I am proud of what you have here. It is so much better than the old flop houses or the old places that we had in my day.

There is not a person in this room who was born into a place like this. All of you came from an age when we didn't have the modern conveniences. We read by kerosene lamps. We didn't have the benefits of electricity. We didn't have the tile on the floor. We didn't have the modern plumbing facilities that you have here.

But we don't have near enough—not even here. I am going to continue to work until the day comes when we can put in every community in this land a place where we can enjoy the twilight of our careers. Not just our mothers and fathers now, but my grandsons and my granddaughters can know that they don't have to pay attention to any son-in-law or any brother-in-law; that they have earned it on their own. They will get their own Social Security check and they can go to a home that is clean, decent, and get a good bed and get good food and get good care.

Their country can do that for them if it does care. This country, under my leadership, does care or else I wouldn't be here tonight.

I am issuing a proclamation here tonight.

This is the first Presidential Proclamation that is issued in a home like this. But it says, "Senior Citizens Month." And the respect that we show for older Americans is not an act of charity. It comes from the recognition that this generation owes all it possesses to those who have borne responsibility in years past.

We have not always recognized the debt that we owe them.

It was three years ago that we first passed Social Security. But we are honoring our fathers and mothers whose days will be long on this earth.

Perhaps the greatest need of age is the need to know that one's contributions are valued.

In a society where youth is so highly prized, older men and women need to know that their wisdom and their experience and the example that they have set in their lives are still important to us and to all their fellow citizens.

Their contributions are one of our nation's most valuable assets—a resource that should be celebrated by every generation.

Therefore, I, Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the entire month of May, 1968, as Senior Citizens Month in honor of them.

I call upon every Federal, State, and local government in partnership with private and voluntary organizations to join in community efforts to give meaning to the theme of this special month—meeting the challenge of the later years.

Let special emphasis this year be placed on making known the contributions that older Americans have made to our welfare.

Let us demonstrate the greatness of our society by bringing new meaning and new vigor to the lives of our elders who built the framework of our present prosperity and our greatness.

So I invite all the Governors of the States, the Governor of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Commissioner of the District of Columbia, and appropriate officials in other areas subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, to join in the observance of Senior Citizens Month.

In witness hereof, I have hereunto set my hand this, the first day of March, at Beaumont, Texas, in the year of our Lord, 1968, and the independence of the United States of America, the 192 year.

So that proclamation is now in force and the month of May will be set aside to honor our elder citizens and our fathers and our mothers.

I have now the first checks of the billions that will go out under this new law. It is not all we wanted. It is the best, though, I could get and it is more than what we had. I am thankful for that.

The first one goes to Miss Helen Hayes McFarland who was born in Fannin, Texas, July 26, 1883. She is 84 years young.

The next is Mr. Luther Napoleon Smith. Mr. Romaldo Perez Torrez, born in Guadalupe, Mexico, in 1887; age 82.

Now, I am going to run along. I have enjoyed being with you so much. I hope everything goes well for you.

I thank you and the people of Beaumont in Jefferson County for all of the good work you do—particularly sending me a good Congressman like Jack Brooks who works for the people.

Our National Security

HON. EDWARD J. GURNEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1968

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation which I hope

will close some gaps in the laws dealing with our internal security. It seeks to combat major weaknesses in the area. It will supplement other bills I have introduced in that regard.

The bill makes it a criminal offense to commit acts which would constitute treason under the Constitution if these acts were committed in time of war. While engaged in undeclared war, as we are, there is no protection. Yet, the need to prohibit willful aid to Vietcong and North Vietnamese adversaries exists to the extent it would were there formal recognition of a state of war.

The bill contains provisions to prohibit employment of known Communists in our Nation's defense plants.

It prohibits reprisals by Government agencies or officials against Government employees because of testimony given before a congressional committee.

The bill would render effective certain portions of the Smith Act of 1940 which the Supreme Court has held invalid or unenforceable. These provisions prohibit certain activities of Communist organizers. They prohibit teaching or advocating the forceful, violent overthrow of the Government of our Nation.

Under this bill, the activities of the Subversive Activities Control Board would be extended and made effective. However, safeguards are provided in that respect.

The bill establishes court priority for cases involving espionage, sabotage, treason, sedition, and certain other subversive activities.

The administration's battle with communism abroad must be balanced with some attention focused on the problem as it exists in our own country.

The President's Health Message

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1968

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, it was in November 1966 that President Johnson signed the Allied Health Professions Personnel Training Act to help increase the numbers of qualified, trained people in the health care field.

Why such a law? Because advances in medical knowledge and new methods of health care had created a complex of more than 80 new health professions. And modern health services could not be delivered properly without people trained in these new occupations.

But as President Johnson observes in his health message, that law will expire on June 30, 1969. The programs authorized by that law have been in operation less than 12 months. We need more experience with, and evaluation of, these programs.

The President recommends that the law authorizing these programs be extended for 4 years. He also recommends two improvements in the present law:

First. An amendment making it clear that the authority to develop, demonstrate, or evaluate curriculums for allied health professionals shall apply

to known as well as new types of health technologists.

The same amendment also would make clear that grants for such projects could be awarded to a wide variety of agencies, institutions, and organizations. The awards would not be limited to schools having training centers for the allied health professions.

Second. An amendment to be effective in fiscal year 1970 providing that up to one-half of 1 percent of the funds appropriated under the law shall be available for evaluation of the programs.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the extension of the Allied Health Professions Personnel Training Act is essential to improved delivery of community and personal health services.

"The Vulnerable Russians"

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1968

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I again bring to the attention of the Members the new book under the title of "The Vulnerable Russians." I believe it deserves the studied attention of every thinking American who is concerned with questions of war and peace, United States-U.S.S.R. relations, and America's future. Authored by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky of Georgetown University, the work is easy reading, revealing, and well documented. It illuminates many fundamental misconceptions held both in official and private circles with regard to the Soviet Union and the Red empire, and it provides concrete alternatives, both in concept and practical action.

"The Vulnerable Russians" is now available at the Georgetown University Bookstore, White Grovenor, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C. However, some excerpts from the book will give the reader an indication of the novel nature of the work:

SOVIET RUSSIAN WEAKNESS AND VULNERABILITIES

"La foiblesse de l'ennemi fait notre propre force."—French Proverb.

One of our guides throughout is the spirit of the quotation above: "The weakness of the enemy forms a part of our own strength." Common sense would dictate that we enhance this form of strength.

STRENGTH-WEAKNESS-VULNERABILITY FORMULA (SWV)

In analyzing the Soviet Russian colossus it is necessary to distinguish, at the outset, between weakness and vulnerability. The two are not identical and should not be confused. A weakness is a condition of defect and impairment which does not in itself constitute a vulnerability. For it to develop into this state requires an active external agent, a stimulus seeking to take advantage of the condition. No doubt there are many deep and open weaknesses in the totalitarian Soviet Russian Empire, but so long as they remain untapped—indeed, in many critical instances unnoticed and even ignored—they cannot by logical definition be deemed vulnerabilities.

According to this formula, the points of Soviet Russian strength increase in some di-

rect proportion to our failure to convert its weaknesses into vulnerabilities, and can substantially decrease in inverse proportion to our success in staging such conversions. Truly, the prodigious irony of the current situation is the fact that beneath the surface of most Soviet Russian accomplishments and points of strength rest their most profound weaknesses.

It is also because in history, logic, and strategy the area of totalitarian Soviet Russian domination and influence over the two dozen captive non-Russian nations still is the primary battleground between the forces of freedom and totalitarian imperialism. The areas of Southeast Asia, Africa, the Middle East, and Latin America are only secondary and tertiary battlegrounds of the enemy's choosing.

As some of us have taught for over a decade, we should consciously recognize that, given our own military build-up, the future will not be one of any global military holocaust involving the insecure forces of Moscow. Instead, it will be one of more or less intense cold war activity, whereby the Russian totalitarians will seek in the best tradition of Russian empire-building to frustrate and sap the will and determination of their targeted victims.

Looking back over the past twenty years, one would be justified in writing a book on our foreign policy under the title "From Air Supremacy and Atomic Monopoly to Non-Victory." This is not a pretty title, but neither is our sad record of losing the peace and also parts of the Free World, piece by piece, twice in this century. Rarely in the history of mankind has a country spent so much in life and treasure for peace and freedom, and yet has lost so much in so little time, than our nation since World War II.

If President Wilson had an accurate knowledge and understanding of the Tsarist Russian Empire, there can be no doubt that he would have listened to the French and applied the basic principle of national self-determination to all the non-Russian nations in that empire. The mythology of Communism and the reality of Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism would surely have been but brief episodes in contemporary history.

And, as will be shown, our operational understanding of Moscow's colonial empire and its effective techniques have not improved much since. This situation is certainly a source of tremendous comfort and encouragement to Moscow and its polyglot satraps. It indicates to them that if they can largely realize their various economic plans, if they can improve and expand their military hardware, if for propaganda and other reasons they can continue their spectacular explorations into space, they will enjoy even greater successes in the Cold War with the diverse instruments and resources produced in these fields.

We cannot too often stress the fact that the techniques of Russian cold war activity are in form and substance old techniques. They are scarcely the creation of self-designated Communists. They are in essence the techniques by which Russian imperio-colonialists were able to build up an unprecedented empire in the past, from Ivan the Terrible down to 1917, and the present empire is substantially a continuation and expansion of the past one.

The real decision before this nation is not whether to push or not to push into space, to disarm or not to disarm, to negotiate or not to negotiate, to trade or not to trade with the Red Empire. Instead, the

basic and real decision is whether to meet or not to meet the full cold war challenge of colonialist Moscow.

In any league the best defense is the offense, and it should be obvious that the defense of freedom is being battered from Viet Nam to Cuba, because our mere defensive and reactive posture is not the best defense. And this is held in full knowledge of all the fears crystallized by such nominal symbols, as "escalation," "confrontation," and "nuclear co-destruction"—repeated symbols which are enough to paralyze the will of any nation.

Put another way, we must study the weaknesses and the associated achievements of the avowed enemy to convert them into vulnerabilities which can be exploited for our national self-preservation and the survival of freedom. A further manifest irony of our present situation is that we would not think twice about attending to this necessity if we were suddenly catapulted into a hot global war but in the more insidious Cold War of our time this necessity is being virtually overlooked.

With this grandiloquent and constant babble Khrushchev enlarged this ideologico-propaganda achievement by convincing many unsuspecting Americans and others that the momentous contest is between two social systems—socialism versus capitalism—in the atmosphere of peaceful co-existence. We are supposed to be in an economic and technologic race, the outcome of which is predestined by Moscow's interpretation of history. As in the case of Hitler and his 1,000 years of the New Order, the Russian totalitarians see themselves riding the wave of the future.

No one will deny that to confuse, deceive, and distort one's chosen opponent is a basic accomplishment in and of itself. As concerns the nature of the struggle and its manifold ramifications, the Russian totalitarians have succeeded in this with us. In the past Russian tyrants cloaked their totalitarian rule and imperialist conquests with equally fictitious ideologies of super-religious Orthodoxy and racist Pan-Slavism. Today it is millenarian Communism, interspersed at times with these old ideologies in what suits the occasion.

The heirs of Pushkin, Tolstoy, Dostoyevsky, and other practical psychologists, have remarkably developed this basic art, to make a relatively backward state with really inferior resources appear as a prime contender to the slumbering American giant, to make the worst empire of its kind appear as the great proponent of national liberation and independence, and to move the minds of millions throughout the world in the belief that all this is so.

Let us recount a few of these weaknesses. After twenty years of so-called indoctrination, millions of Ukrainians, Georgians, Russians, and others deserted colonialist Moscow in World War II; after ten years of heavy propaganda, Hungarian students and workers staged the 1956 revolution, shouting "Russky, go home"; after years of enslavement in the Vorkuta, Karaganda, and other labor correction camps, inmates of all different nations struck for freedom. These outstanding examples are only a few of the hundreds proving the utter bankruptcy of what we uncritically call Communist ideology.

Our Voice of America is but a pygmy compared to Moscow's communications media. To make matters worse, the policies of the United States Information Agency run

counter to the task of developing vulnerabilities in the USSR. For example, by virtue of Congressional hearings in 1958, the USIA was stopped in its attempt to curtail and eliminate Lithuanian, Ukrainian, Georgian, and other non-Russian broadcasts to the USSR. It sought to have the captive non-Russian peoples listen to the language of their Moscow captor.

If we are to win the Cold War—a thought many Americans have come to abhor—we must recognize and constantly stress the real threat which Soviet Russian mythology conceals. And this is the Soviet Russian imperio-colonialist system of totalitarian rule. Make no mistake about this. This is not a matter of academic theorization and speculation. As the preceding chapters have in part shown, it has been successfully tested and, indeed, more tests are in order so that this fundamental truth would be ingrained in the minds of our people and the people of the world. It is scarcely comforting to learn, alas, that we are fighting against a mythology, but it is reassuring to know that along with all the captive nations in Moscow's empire we have pierced through the mythological facade of Communism to the real enemy, Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism.

It is such a cross-purpose operation that causes men like Madariaga to say, "This is a war of ideas, brains, and heart. The West's foreign policy is passive and flaccid. It will never get an understanding with Russia. How about Russian imperialism? It's the worst imperialism the world has ever known."

MOSCOW'S EXPANDED EMPIRE

Well, how about Russian imperialism? Let us take another look at it. The second general area of Moscow's obvious strength is its expanded empire. Contrary to much wishful thinking about Red China and Albania, about "the slow fragmentation of the Communist bloc," the Soviet Russian Empire continues to consolidate itself in substantial terms of economic integration, military accretion, and an expedient exploitation of nationalist forces.

Moscow plays every angle to strengthen its hold on the empire, on both the captives within the Soviet Union and on captives outside it. Feelings of Pan-Slavism, religious Orthodoxy, national pride, past hatreds, and national uncertainty toward the future are exploited. Disagreement with Red China and Albania is more of a proof of this overall tendency of expedient accommodation than of any basic disintegrative tendency.

Those who now preach that the Soviet Russian Empire is showing signs of disintegration, that the future is with us, that all that is required is a military build-up and trade with this empire, are gravely misleading the citizens of this country. There is no substantial evidence of this. In fact, all the important and basic evidence of increasing empire strength points the other way.

Yet beneath the surface of this imperial power and strength lies the most profound weakness of the Soviet Union and of the entire structure of Moscow's imperio-colonialist rule. This weakness is the immense, latent power of genuine patriotic nationalism, both within and outside the Soviet Union. This weakness is so deep that despite his public disclaimers of Stalinist terrorism, Khrushchev deemed it necessary to have two Ukrainian nationalist leaders in exile murdered.

Few Americans are aware of the vicious denunciations made by Moscow and others against the 1965 Captive Nations Week. Here are some choice examples: Mikhail Suslov, chief Russian ideologist and Secretary of the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party, declaimed, "Especially disgusting is the villainous demagoguery of the imperialist chieftains of the United States. Each year they organize the so-called captive nations week, hypocritically pretending to be defenders of nations that have escaped from their yoke."

The USSR economy is and always has been a war economy in essence. With a gross imperial product of only about forty-five percent of our GNP, with an industrial output of about fifty-five percent of ours and requiring over twenty percent more labor, with an agricultural output below ours by about one-third and requiring fifty percent of their labor force as against ten percent of ours, with available goods and services only thirty-three percent of ours and on a per capita basis only twenty-five percent of ours, and with the inevitable problems of growth yet to be fully experienced by it, Moscow has a long way to go to match our economy.

Perhaps even clearer and more distinct SWV aspects appear in the military-space field. The general and specific strengths of the USSR in this area are the consummate result of top priority allocation in this war economy. Matching our total military expenditures in dollar volume, over twenty percent of the gross product in the USSR goes to military pursuits. Every weapon, every means from ICBM's to pistols, receives high qualitative and quantitative development. In space exploration, tremendously expensive in itself, Moscow made an early start under the rule of inordinate concentration.

Behind the military technocracy in the USSR lie deep weaknesses which no amount of nuclear blackmail or military display can hide. Before World War I the Russian Tsar virtually terrorized the capitals of Western Europe with the threat of the great Russian "steamroller," the vast imperial forces of the Russian Empire. Today, following in the paved traditions of Russian cold war diplomacy, Moscow threatens us and the world with "global missiles."

The ultimate weapon still is man and his morale, loyalties and will. No one is more aware than Moscow of the overriding fact that, despite changing military technology, in all three major wars in this century the motley and multi-national forces of the Russian Empire, whether Tsarist or Soviet, disintegrated early. As was indicated before, in the Russo-Japanese War and the two World Wars, political factors associated with the freedom of the Russian people and the independence of the non-Russian nations accounted for this record.

Not unlike the Nazi Party under Hitler, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union is the cohesive agent of totalitarian Soviet Russian strength. There are some twelve million in the Party today, but this figure is misleading. Predominantly Russian, the Party consists of members with families, relatives, and associates who, though not members, share both material and spiritual interests in the strength and power of the Party. And these number well over thirty-five million. The Party, thus, is the strong vehicle for totalitarian rule in the empire and for subversive conspiracy beyond it.

Voice of Democracy Contest First Place Winner

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1968

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, the challenge of freedom is approached in a variety of ways by each American. Miss Roberta Weissman of Stamford, Conn., offers an incisive commentary on this subject which won her first place among Connecticut contestants in the Veterans of Foreign Wars Voice of Democracy Contest:

VOICE OF DEMOCRACY: FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE
(By Roberta Weissman)

"Born free, as free as the wind blows. . ." words to a song which harmonizes with an American dream. America, Land of the Free, has long been the haven for the oppressed, yet even here, can man ever be born free? Is an American presented at birth with an abstract packet of liberty which makes him the free person we cherish in our conception of Western Man?

I believe not. Every generation must re-achieve freedom, and therein lies freedom's challenge. It is not an inherited commodity, not essential in the nature of any being. The animal, supposedly "born free" is really a slave to his instincts, and the wind has no choice about blowing. Man alone comprehends the higher aspects of his will, through which he liberates himself and earns those precious rights Americans possess—most valuable among them our guaranteed opportunity to choose for ourselves personal values, religion, morals, vocations, expressions and opinions. We are not born free. We must not believe that freedom, like physical height, is part of an American's genes. Instead we believe in exercising and protecting free choice. This is what we are doing in our legislatures, in Vietnam, and in our homes.

Becoming free is mostly an internal challenge. Each individual American must liberate himself from within, release his mind from the bondage of bigotry, the narrow-mindedness of self-interest, and the limitations of desires. Then we can fulfill our national role in humanity as a nation of free men, made free, not born free. Free men, not robots mechanically following the dictates of fear, greed, or ambition. We must assure that the opportunity for the perpetuation of freedom remains opened to our children. After that, it's up to them. Though we cannot hand down true freedom, we can insure the existence of a legislative process and social structure devoted to the promotion of free thought, the indispensable foundation of free men. Such is the legacy we ourselves have received, and through expression, devotion, and occasionally armed force, we have managed to preserve this legacy for the future.

Then freedom presents two challenges, that of protecting our means of attaining freedom, and that of freeing oneself. The first is clearly recognized and supported, but the second is obscure, highly dependent upon the first. Too many people believe we are born free, and through this error they fail to progress onward to true freedom. Born free? Impossible!

Self-contradictory, in fact, because to be so would remove that essential element of free choice. Becoming free is the challenge to each individual which must be met, and when it is, America will stand stronger than ever before, fulfilling the highest potential of humanity.

Mark Anthony Borreliz Hawaii Finalist in VFW Speech Contest

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1968

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, next week the final judging of the annual Voice of Democracy contest conducted by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its ladies auxiliary will take place here in the Nation's Capitol.

The finalist from the 50th State is Mark Anthony Borreliz, of Aiea, Hawaii, and I wish to extend warmest congratulations to Mark on his very excellent speech.

The VFW is to be commended, also, for making the Voice of Democracy contest possible and affording this opportunity to so many deserving young people. The contest theme this year was "Freedom's Challenge," and more than 400,000 high school students across the Nation competed for the five scholarships which are awarded as the top prizes.

Mark Anthony Borreliz speaks well for the youth of Hawaii and the Nation in his award-winning presentation, which I am pleased to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the widespread reading it merits:

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

(By Mark Anthony Borreliz)

Seven children were born at the same moment on the same day but in different nations. Three of these children were fated to die of starvation in an overpopulated land. One of them would lead a restricted life under the Communist system. Two of them would deteriorate in uneducated poverty. The seventh—and only that one—would grow up in a country with far more promising opportunity. We know that country as the United States of America, that opportunity as freedom.

Or do we? Do we really know what freedom is? Do we really understand just what there is in this seven-letter word that can hold a nation of fifty states together? Just what is this thing our ancestors called freedom?

Too often an American will answer: "Freedom? I guess it's the right to do what you want." But he is wrong. The definition is incomplete, for something needs to be tacked on. Instead, let it read: "Freedom—the right to do what we want to within the American responsibility."

Now, who will define the American responsibility? Perhaps we might turn for this to a voice we should all listen to more carefully as it explains: "Americans, be proud, for you know me as freedom. You have known me for 200 years. I fostered you, led you, built you."

But now another voice—call it apathy, anti-patriotism, un-Americanism—interrupts: "Two hundred years is a long time. Maybe back then, Freedom, you were great. What about now?"

I, Freedom, say: "Americans, be proud. Your forefathers had a glorious dream. They made it come true in me. The insights into liberty that were prominent then are prominent now. What other nation sees glory in a bronze bell with a crack in it, or lets a statue stand in a harbor where a communications center might be more practical? Americans, you have a heritage. Remember it; live up to it and let this be the American responsibility."

"But, Freedom, what kind of nation is this when you must protest to avoid military service? Is this a freedom, too?"

"Americans, be proud, for it is I, Freedom, who allows you to protest. You have many more freedoms, many more rights, and many duties to accompany them. Your honor is in knowing that you can perform them. You can do much in even the smallest things. Go ahead and vote, attend open legislatures, buy Christmas seals, support VISTA, avoid being a litter bug, turn on your headlights on Veterans' Day. Let all of these little things make up the important thing we call American responsibility."

"But, Freedom, these things cannot be done when you grow so weak that no one cares about you."

"Americans, be yet proud. I am weak, so weak that other governments put up walls to stop their people from knowing me. People care so little about me that their sons would die in my defense. No, Americans, I Freedom, am not weak. You have been a select people in knowing me but now you must extend me to the rest of the world. Let this, too, be the American responsibility. Let all three of these be the American responsibility. First, recognize your heritage; love your country and its ideals. Second, realize the services you owe your country and perform them. Finally, when you know me, let the rest of the world know me. This is the American responsibility. I challenge you to accept it."

So this is freedom's challenge. Now it—like all challenges—can be accepted, shrugged aside, or retreated from. I believe that we have already accepted it, and apparently so believed the late John Kennedy when he said: "We are Americans. That is a proud boast. That is a great privilege, to be a citizen of the United States, and we must meet our responsibilities."

Or have we not realized we are that seventh child?

Rev. Phil W. Barrett, D.D., Gives the Invocation at the Lincoln Day Dinner of the Santa Clara County Republican Central Committee

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1968

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, each day in our newspapers, on radio, and on television we read and hear of clergymen who are engaged in urging young people to break the law, who encourage civil disobedience as a proper expression of dissent, and who sometimes actually debase our national morals and principles.

Oftentimes these activities are justified as "matters of conscience". I will not attempt to become the judge of another man's conscience, but I do think it is noteworthy that the overwhelming majority of our Nation's clergymen are primarily engaged in preaching the word of God and assuming moral leadership of their parishioners. Personally, I think it would be a great mistake if we were to judge our churches as institutions and our clergymen as Americans by the work of a few who make the headlines.

Mr. Speaker, on February 16, I was privileged to be the main speaker at the Lincoln Day Dinner sponsored by the Santa Clara County Republican Central Committee. Dr. Phil W. Barrett of the

First Presbyterian Church in San Jose rendered one of the most inspiring invocations I have ever heard. I believe Dr. Barrett's words eloquently state the effectiveness of the moral leadership given to the American people by most clergymen. The invocation follows:

INVOCATION BY DR. PHIL W. BARRETT OF FIRST PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH AT THE LINCOLN DAY DINNER OF THE SANTA CLARA COUNTY REPUBLICAN PARTY, SAN JOSE CIVIC AUDITORIUM, FEBRUARY 16, 1968

Almighty God, Who dost hold the nations of the world in the palm of Thine hand, and Who hast made and preserved us a Nation, we pause to thank Thee for the rich heritage of freedom we have from those who settled and founded this Republic. We are grateful for the right of free expression of our philosophies and ideals, given to all men in this land, and pray that we may ever be reminded that with the priceless heritage of freedom there also goes awesome responsibility.

In a day when men seek to cover their nudity of hatred, malice and license with the fig leaf of freedom, and in the name of peace turn our cities into battlegrounds and our campuses into armed camps, enable us to stand for justice, law and integrity, and to follow the example of the Great Emancipator to bind up the nation's wounds. We pray Thy blessing on those in positions of elected authority in city, state and nation; those who represent us in the legislative, executive and judicial branches of government; and for our honored guests here this evening, representing us in the halls of Congress, our State Legislature and County and City Governments.

We give Thee thanks for our Republican Party, for the leadership it has provided in the good days and in the desperate days of our Country—especially during the administration of Abraham Lincoln whose memory we honor this night—and in all days when men and women of strong faith in democracy, of depth and wisdom in character and life have used their talents for the good of the Commonwealth.

We pause to remember those tremendous youth of our Nation, who fight our battles on land, on sea, in the air and under the sea—those who have not burned their draft cards, nor with the odor of the great unwashed and the voice of vulgarity sought to impede those who still believe this is the greatest Country on earth. Be with them, their leaders and their families.

We thank Thee for basic tenets and beliefs of our Party, for strong foundations and unremitting loyalty to those things which men hold most dear, and which are valued most when they are withheld.

We thank Thee for fellowship and food, and pray Thy blessing on this gathering, that it might enrich the appreciation of our Country and of those who represent us. Help us to re-dedicate ourselves to God and Country, that as one who led us through the dark days and gave his life for his beliefs and Country once said—"The government of the people, by the people and for the people shall not perish from this earth." To that end we work, and to that end we pray. Amen.

An Open Letter to White Folks

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1968

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders has concluded that this country

runs the risk of being two nations, one white and one black, separate and unequal.

The Commission points out that one of the most serious problems in this crisis is the lack of communication between the races and the lack of understanding by the white majority of the everyday problems and concerns of members of the black minority.

Particularly time, therefore, are comments made by Columnist Andrew Ramsey in the March 2 issue of the widely respected Negro weekly newspaper, the Indianapolis Recorder.

Mr. Ramsey notes the potential for violence and destruction which the race problem poses for this country. He urges that whites, "in their businesses, their offices, their churches, and their neighborhoods accord to Negroes the treatment due to every human being as an equal before the Supreme Ruler of the Universe."

And Mr. Ramsey concludes his column:

Racial isolation must be ended before human brotherhood can begin to be practiced.

Following is Mr. Ramsey's column, which I would like to share with my colleagues:

AN OPEN LETTER TO WHITE FOLKS

(By Andrew W. Ramsey)

MY DEAR FELLOW CITIZENS: Ordinarily the white people who might be reached by this article are those who never read it, but this one is intended both for them and for those who are either liberal enough or curious enough to read *The Recorder* and for those who avoid all things Negro.

You are all afraid that we shall have riots this summer in Indianapolis and we may well have. We, too, are afraid that things might come to that and we are further afraid that if riots are in the making for Indianapolis this summer or the next two or three there is nothing we can do to stop them at this late date.

You are, we learn, quite perturbed at the rise of Negro chauvinism under the name of "Black Power." Most of us deplore the philosophy of those who would substitute black racism for white racism, but we understand the frustrations of those who parade under the banner of "Black Power" and we know that they are creations of the white majority, who have grudgingly conceded to Negroes their God-given rights inch by inch while maintaining white supremacy.

We know also that it is not just the members of the white hate groups which have held the Negro in spiritual bondage for more than a century. We accuse the "good white people" who really run things in this land of ours for going along with programs destined to "keep the Negro in his place."

We are not naive enough to think that the sheet-wearing, cross burning bigots really run America. We know that they are not the ones who control the jobs which are denied to Negroes and for the most part they are not the ones who build the swank suburbs which exclude Negroes.

It is the "good white people" who do not stoop to the use of racial epithets, and who often play the role of the liberal who determine how and where America lives and the schools in which the children of America are educated. We have watched as they are contributed to the growing isolation which is fast separating America along both racial and economic lines by putting distance between them and the Negroes to whom they openly advocate giving a fair shake.

We have watched not without some alarm how they have moved their churches and their household goods along with them to the suburbs which are strangling every city in America and we have read unimpressed as their church denominations have passed pious resolutions deploring the plight of the Negro in America and in our imaginations we have pictured the gallons of alligator tears shed by the faithful as they continue to worship in their racial and economic citadels of religion.

We have also felt the insulting sting of the patronizing attitude which prompts so many white leaders to work for the token representation of Negroes in place heretofore reserved for WASP folk (White, Anglo-Saxon Protestant).

We realize that the number of whites who would eagerly place us back into slavery is very small these days, but their number is made more effective by the large number of whites who sit on the sidelines and do nothing while the situation of the Negro in America becomes more and more untenable for an increasingly large percentage of Negroes out of step with human dignity for practically all the rest.

We should perhaps be grateful for the fact that you have been turning the great cities of America over to us as the years go thus enabling us to elect the mayors in more and more cities in the not so distant future and also of permitting us to elect Negroes to Congress from areas deserted by whites.

But we are not grateful. You are turning over to us the cities with which you have failed and as the cities continue to decay and die you can use the scapegoats to explain the crime.

Some of us have been telling you all of this century that the American body politic was ailing and that until the cancer of racism was eradicated, America stood to lose not only her soul but her body, but you have chosen not to listen to us and now the black power advocates and the riots are telling you the same things but in nastier tones and you are only half listening. Your answer to them is to jail the black power advocates and use police and soldiers guns to subdue the riots. Those means will not stop either.

Our nation is now faced with the alternatives of granting full human rights to the Negro or a gigantic civil war in which white would be against black. Such a conflict we could not hope to win, nor could white America afford in the Twentieth Century to indulge in genocide or ruthless slaughter of those who possessed a high degree of visibility.

All of the white who happen to read this piece are in the position of doing something to keep this awful day of reckoning from coming to pass. They can in their businesses, their offices, their churches and their neighborhoods accord to Negroes the treatment due to every human being as an equal before the Supreme Ruler of the Universe.

Racial isolation must be ended before human brotherhood can begin to be practiced.

Andreas Papandreou to Visit Washington

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1968

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, next week a former member of the Greek Parliament, the Honorable Andreas Papandreou, will be visiting Washington and, undoubtedly, will have numerous opportunities to express his critical views on the situation in Greece. In order that

we might ponder the situation in Greece with necessary objectivity I place in the *RECORD* an article from the March 3 edition of the *Beacon-News*, Aurora, Ill., by the Copley Press International correspondent, Dumitru Danielopol, presenting his analysis of Andreas Papandreou:

UNITED STATES SEEMS TO BE IMPORTING (COMMIE) IDEAS

(By Dumitru Danielopol)

WASHINGTON.—"Strange world we are living in when Americans try to import communism into Greece."

I wrote that from Athens on Aug. 2, 1966. Now we seem to be importing the ideas into the United States.

The Americans I had in mind were Andreas Papandreou—a former citizen and son of ex-Premier George Papandreou—and his American wife described by U.S. diplomats as a left wing "firebrand."

In 1966 Greece had the jitters. The Papandreou machinations were giving communism a chance once again to show its ugly head.

Greeks could still remember the Red guerrilla war that ransacked their country in the late 1940s.

Andreas, as minister of coordination in his father's cabinet, had been involved in the secret ASPIDA plot to undermine the army, overthrow the monarchy, take Greece out of NATO and install a socialist dictatorship. He was working with Communist elements, though he was not regarded as a party man.

He was charged with treason in civil court, but as a member of parliament, he was immune from arrest.

After the April 21, 1967, military coup in Athens which dissolved parliament, he was imprisoned.

He was awaiting trial for treason when the military government amnestied him last Christmas and acceded to his request to leave Greece.

Papandreou is now touring northern Europe where he has the colossal nerve to proclaim himself as the champion of democracy in Greece.

In some countries he's getting away with it. In Stockholm Premier Tage Erlander has promised Andreas financial support from his Social Democratic Party to help "overthrow the military regime."

Other left or center parties in Scandinavia may follow suit.

Now he has been invited to the United States and has been offered a lecturer's post at Northwestern University and other schools.

He has been greeted with open arms by the "intellectual" branch of the Americans for Democratic Action.

In a way, it's all so discouraging.

Why are so many people anxious to be fooled by the likes of Andreas Papandreou?

As a youth, in 1938, he was arrested as a Trotskyist. He was not tried, but he betrayed his comrades who were all arrested. Thanks to his father's influence he was allowed to emigrate to the United States in 1940.

He refused the call to arms when Italy attacked Greece the same year. When his new country was attacked in 1941 he stayed on the sidelines until 1944 when he enlisted as a Navy nurse's aide and worked in a Florida hospital. He made no move to fight the Greek Communist guerrillas in the late 1940's.

He taught economics in several American colleges until 1959 when he finally went back to Greece—as an American citizen. Only in 1963, when he stepped into active politics, did he revert back to Greek citizenship.

"After his arrival in Greece," wrote A. S. Sulzberger of the New York Times, "he came in contact with important foreign communists."

An unclassified USIA report said that Andreas, on finding that the extreme left was growing stronger "fell in its embrace."

"What did Andreas stand for?" I asked from Athens in this column on June 16, 1967.

"I wish we knew," said a former Parliamentarian. He was against the crown, the dynasty, the establishment, the army, any wealthy person, NATO, the United States, the war in Vietnam, etc., but he never said what he was for. He was promising the type of pie in the sky Greeks know he can't deliver."

Now this man proclaims himself the champion of Greek democracy—a role that even his anti-junta former colleagues in Athens denounce.

Do we need his type in the United States?

United Aircraft Unveils Pioneer Job-Training Plan

HON. THOMAS J. MESKILL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1968

Mr. MESKILL. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to call to the attention of the House a remarkable announcement recently made by the United Aircraft Corp. UAC is going to establish, at company expense, a job-training center in the north section of Hartford. Its purpose will be to train so-called unemployable citizens. Successful graduates of this course will be guaranteed jobs at United Aircraft.

As far as I know, this is the first operation of its kind in the country. I hope many other industries will follow suit. It is imperative that they do so and that the Federal Government encourage them.

Good communities mean good business and a healthy country. Good communities can only come when the citizens are employed at useful work, adequately paid, and when all citizens have a direct interest in the general welfare of the community. To be happy, a man or woman must be involved and appreciated and rewarded. United Aircraft, under the leadership of its president, Mr. William P. Gwinn, is taking the lead in what I earnestly hope is a movement—crusade, if you will—to build a stronger, happier America.

I offer the company's statement describing its job-training plans at this point in the RECORD with my highest commendations. I hope all Members will have an opportunity to read it and show it to industrial leaders in their areas.

The statement follows:

United Aircraft Corporation will establish and operate a training facility in the north section of Hartford to help unemployed and so-called unemployable persons prepare themselves for entry-level jobs with Greater Hartford business firms.

The program is scheduled to begin in May. Initially it will be conducted on a modest, experimental scale with the costs borne by the corporation, William P. Gwinn, president of United Aircraft, said today in making the announcement.

The corporation will establish, equip, staff, and maintain a training center in 10,000 square feet of floor space which it plans to lease and renovate on the second floor of

the former Fuller Brush Company building on North Main Street in Hartford.

With an initial class enrollment of 35, the center will carry out basic training for jobs to be provided by manufacturing plants in the Greater Hartford area, including United Aircraft.

While in training, the trainee will be paid at a fixed hourly rate by his sponsoring employer, who also will assure him a regular job on successful completion of the training program.

The training will cover not only occupational subjects but will also include basic education in such areas as language and computational skills and in social and work-related responsibilities.

The training to be provided by United Aircraft is part of a broader effort, directed at local hard core unemployment, being developed within the Greater Hartford business community. A number of businesses, industries, and other organizations, including the Manufacturers Association of Hartford County and the Greater Hartford Chamber of Commerce, are cooperating in the effort.

For instructors, United Aircraft will draw largely from the training staffs of its two Hartford area divisions, Pratt & Whitney Aircraft in East Hartford and Hamilton Standard in Windsor Locks. United Aircraft has available to its employees one of the most extensive training programs in American industry. At its Pratt & Whitney Aircraft division alone, more than 1,000 employees are enrolled in training courses at any given time.

Mr. Gwinn said that, in undertaking the program, United is responding to President Johnson's request that business and industry help solve the problem of hard core unemployment at the local level.

"Establishment of the training center," Mr. Gwinn said, "is an expression of our concern for those local citizens whose best chances for obtaining and holding jobs lie in their receiving special training and attention at fundamental levels and on an individual basis. With the active help of other industries and businesses in the Greater Hartford area in providing the necessary job opportunities, we hope to take so-called unemployables, provide them with basic training and counseling tailored to their individual needs, and have them emerge as job-holding, wage-earning members of society."

"This United Aircraft-financed operation," Mr. Gwinn said, "is an entirely new concept so far as we know, and whether it will yield productive results can be determined only after the project has been in effect for several months. We are purposely starting on a limited, experimental scale, since we have much to learn. We hope our efforts will grow into a worthwhile program that may contribute in some measure to solving hard core unemployment among residents of Hartford."

After considering a number of approaches, Mr. Gwinn said, United Aircraft concluded that "we could contribute most effectively by applying, to the undereducated and disadvantaged who genuinely want help, the experience and techniques in job-oriented training which we have acquired over many years of providing training for our employees in the variety of skills required in our own plants."

Mr. Gwinn pointed out that the new training center represents a second recent step by the corporation in contributing to the solution of hard core unemployment.

In Riverside, California, an area of high unemployment among Mexican-Americans, United Aircraft is building a new plant for the production of a reinforced plastic pipe, called Techite (R), developed by its United Technology Center division. Initially the plant will provide employment for about 200 persons.

Hon. Charles H. Silver Awarded Annual Brotherhood Award of Jewish War Veterans

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1968

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, Charles H. Silver, consultant to the mayor of the city of New York, former president of the Board of Education of New York City, and president of the Board of Directors of Beth Israel Medical Center of New York, was honored by the Jewish War Veterans on February 15 when they presented him with their annual brotherhood award. At the ceremony, which was held at the Beth Israel Medical Center, the benediction was delivered by Msgr. Christopher G. Kane, director of health and hospitals, archdiocese of New York.

I include at this point in the RECORD the benediction of Monsignor Kane and the response of Charles H. Silver:

BENEDICTION DELIVERED BY MSGR. CHRISTOPHER G. KANE, DIRECTOR OF HEALTH AND HOSPITALS, ARCHDIOCESE OF NEW YORK, AT BROTHERHOOD AWARD, JEWISH WAR VETERANS, TO MR. CHARLES H. SILVER, FEBRUARY 15, 1968, BETH ISRAEL MEDICAL CENTER, NEW YORK, N.Y.

I would be remiss if I did not publicly acknowledge with gratitude the tributes expressed by the Jewish War Veterans and Mr. Silver in memory of the late Cardinal Spellman. And as a personal friend of Charles Silver, I am delighted to represent Archbishop Maguire and the Catholic hospitals and schools of the Archdiocese in witnessing one of New York City's great fathers receiving the Brotherhood Award of the Jewish War Veterans. And I thank Dr. Cecil Sheps and the Nursing Students of Beth Israel for their gracious hospitality.

I recall reading the history of Beth Israel Medical Center—the discouragement felt by the original Board of Directors in 1889 over the neglect shown for the sick, the elderly and the poor of this neighborhood. How triumphantly this discouragement has been dispelled by Mr. Silver and his Board of Directors! An awareness of the needs of their brothers coupled with a voluntary effort to improve their plight was the double force which has brought this vital medical center to its rightful place in the history of our great City. During the hospital's lifetime, many hands and many hearts have provided the catalyst of concern. It is expressed eloquently in the Credo of President Silver as "Utter Unselfishness leading to Great Effectiveness."

And again, offering his services to his brothers in the trying field of education, I recall the words of President Silver in his 1961 message to the Governor and the Legislature:

"I have been blessed with the chance to serve the boys and girls of our City as a member and president of the Board of Education for almost ten years. When I was appointed to the Board, critics said a business man could not devote enough time to the position, so I broke off business connections at great personal loss and each day have worked at Board headquarters until the late hours of the afternoon. I have visited schools frequently. I have sat and talked with children of all races, colors and creeds in the classrooms, playgrounds, cafeterias and laboratories. I have had heart-warming conversations with thousands of their dedicated

teachers. I will treasure forever the memory of this wonderful experience. . . .

"At any rate, regardless of the outcome of events, either as a Board member or as a private citizen, I will work for the welfare of our children as long as God gives me the strength."

It would be impossible for me to add words to appropriately describe the great motivation behind the unique man you have chosen to honor. He has personally embodied the player of Maimonides in his very life, so let this be our Benediction:

"Let me be contented in every thing except in the great science of my profession. Never allow the thought to arise in me that I have attained to sufficient knowledge, but vouchsafe to me the strength, the leisure and the ambition ever to extend my knowledge. For art is great, but the mind of man is ever expanding."

To this prayer of Maimonides, Mr. Silver, we add a resounding "Amen" and pray the good Lord to reward you and us with your continued presence and leadership for a host of years to come.

ADDRESS BY HON. CHARLES H. SILVER UPON RECEIPT OF ANNUAL BROTHERHOOD AWARD OF JEWISH WAR VETERANS OF THE UNITED STATES, NEW YORK COUNTY COUNCIL, FEBRUARY 15, 1968

The purpose of this evening has far greater significance than the high honor you are paying me.

Indeed, rather than be honored by you—I let me honor you, for I know the impressive list of projects and public services by which the Jewish War Veterans have underlined the cause of Brotherhood. I know your admirable record of compassion and concern for American fighting men in every corner of the earth . . . for the injured and the ill in Veterans Hospitals all over America, regardless of race or religion.

You are to be congratulated on your constant struggle for Human Rights, your battle against the John Birch Society and, perhaps, most of all for the Group Libel Legislation you have advocated to prohibit the public abuse of any people.

It means much that you consider me one of you and that you have selected me as a symbol of your struggle to make Brotherhood not just a word but a way of life . . . not a seven-day wonder whose observance is celebrated for a single week and then forgotten, but the eternal light of man's love and compassion for his fellow man . . . the flame, the soul, the conscience of humanity.

Only by such complete dedication as yours can we bring our country through the troubled years ahead.

Our problems are overwhelming. There is protest in our streets—nor is the tide of battle always with us on the remote frontiers of democracy.

The news may become worse before it gets better.

We are facing enormous dangers. We may suffer some defeats. But we must not let these setbacks drive us into panic or narrow isolation or blind hatred.

We and our adversaries are locked in a mortal struggle not just for a few square miles of blood-soaked earth or the right to sail our ships with freedom and security on the seven seas. We are struggling for the faith and loyalty and respect of millions upon millions in the East and the West, in Africa, Asia and in our own hemisphere.

We are winning their friendship and trust and their belief—restored again—that this land which saw a new birth of freedom in the world will not stand idly by and see it die.

And if we are to win this war for the minds and souls of men of good will, we can no longer deny the evidence of racial bigotry and acts of violence against minorities within our own land. These make a mockery of

the sacred principles of freedom we are seeking to establish in other lands.

Bigotry and intolerance pose as serious a threat to America's future as a Communist advance against our fighting men on the embattled plains around Saigon.

We must prove that the United States intends to preserve the liberties we love—and to protect a society that will remain forever free, just and humane—A way of life that rejects poverty, ignorance, discrimination and intolerance at home, just as it resists tyranny and slavery in other parts of the world.

What hope can we offer to any land if our talk is from the teeth out and not from the heart—if we set ourselves up as the false proclaimers of Brotherhood while so many of our fellow Americans suffer the insults of second-class citizenship?

We weep for the infant bleeding after bombs have fallen in the jungle. We make his tragic plight our problem because we are a decent and conscientious people. But is the child neglected in our schools or deprived in his home or despised on our streets, because of the color of his skin or the place of his origin, any less a challenge to our conscience?

The quality of brotherhood—like that of mercy—is not strained. It is not this much more for one and that much less for another.

Brotherhood is equal. It is indivisible.

We are truly our brother's keeper—or we are hypocrites—and have no business preaching the virtues of a Brotherhood to which we do not even belong.

When we deny the blessings of brotherhood, of liberty and equality to others, we place our own freedom in jeopardy . . . For every human being is alike in the eyes of his Creator, entitled to share equally in the bright and glorious heritage of a land that was founded on the guarantee of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness for all people.

Unless we—who believe in democracy—teach it to our children, the disbelievers will thrust our nation backward toward intellectual slavery, economic inequality and racial bigotry.

Then, the farmakers and the warmongers can move in for the kill.

Perhaps the crisis that piles on crisis in each day's news from abroad and the din of dissension outside our very door permit us no pause to reflect on the old ideals of character, loyalty and public service . . . or to communicate them to the young.

I will admit that it is not easy to focus the child's mind on a "shot heard 'round the world" that happened long ago, at Lexington and Concord, while, today, someone is shooting at the moon . . . and, tomorrow, they may be shooting at us.

But it is our job to make young people understand—that America will remain the land of the free only so long as it remains the home of the brave.

When I think of America, I marvel at the number of other lands which have contributed to the creation and development of this blessed country. It is like looking at a rainbow and realizing how many colors have fused and blended to fashion its blazing glory.

Today, despite the burning of our Embassies and the indignities to our Flag by those who bite the hand that feeds them, the most envied title in the world is still that of being a Citizen of the United States of America.

This remains true not alone because we are strong and proud, but because we are humble guardians of a sacred freedom that we are happy to share with others.

Brotherhood is the Eternal Light of man's love and compassion for his fellow man. It is the flame, the soul, the conscience of humanity . . .

Keep "Brotherhood" alive, so that liberty can never die . . . so that America may live on as an eternal symbol of hope to all peoples of the earth.

I know that if he had lived, my cherished friend, His Eminence Francis Cardinal Spellman, would have been here beside me this evening, passionately attesting to his faith in the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man.

And I remember, as if he were truly here—and I know his spirit must be in this room—the words he spoke at a dinner of the Alfred E. Smith Memorial Foundation. I pass them on to you as the keynote of this meeting.

The Cardinal said: "The heart of all true Americans unites in a common bond of loyalty, respecting our fellow men of all races, all nations, all peoples and creeds because we are children of one God."

I feel that his words which he repeated as a Catholic Chaplain on so many battlefields where our fighting men greeted him in so many distant places must find an echo in your own hearts as Jewish Veterans of these same wars.

Tonight we have met in testament to the fact that we are comrades—all of us—in the even greater struggle to bring the blessings of brotherhood and peace to every human being on the face of the earth.

The forces opposing us are mighty . . . but we shall conquer.

For if ever there was a Holy War . . . this is it.

That is why I rejoice to be your brother in arms.

That is why my heart is too full to tell you how much I am moved by your tribute.

The times are unpredictable. Dark tides are running high around us. Hates and fears are strong even yet and being stirred by evil men.

Prejudice, our ancient enemy, still has its legions.

But the victory shall be ours, my brother . . . because I am your brother . . . and you are mine.

Veterans' Administration Promotes Discriminatory Land Exchange That Would Destroy Public Park and Recreation Facility in Low-Income, High-Population East Los Angeles Area

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1968

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned that the Veterans' Administration is continuing to actively promote a grossly discriminatory land exchange scheme in the city of Los Angeles that would deprive a low-income, high-population area of East Los Angeles of an existing and desperately needed public park and recreation facility.

This proposed property trade between the VA and the city of Los Angeles would give away the city's east-side Hazard Park land to the VA for use as a possible future hospital site, in exchange for federally owned property near affluent Westwood, in order to provide land for development of a new west-side city park in the Bel Air/Brentwood area.

I have denounced this property-swap proposal as an out-and-out land grab, that would permanently deny thousands of families, and particularly the young

people, living in the vicinity of Hazard Park, the use of vital recreation and park facilities they so urgently need.

As the Representative of the citizens of this area in Congress, I cannot protest too strongly against such highhanded and arbitrary action by public officials—action that totally disregards the pressing recreation requirements of this section of the city.

We all know that the Hazard Park area has one of the highest population concentrations in the State of California, and with a family ratio to total population also among the highest, the critical need for such facilities is probably greater here than in any other place in the city of Los Angeles.

And, though I am fully in favor of building the veterans' hospital, I simply cannot see the necessity of sacrificing and bartering away one of the few remaining community recreation facilities still available to residents of the Hazard Park area—just to promote a multimillion-dollar park project in West Los Angeles.

Mr. Speaker, I have repeatedly suggested consideration of several alternate construction sites near Hazard Park—including one now being utilized as a 20-acre junkyard—which would be suitable as possible location for the proposed veterans' hospital.

But, I regret to say that neither the VA nor the Los Angeles City Planning Department has ever made any alternate site studies to determine whether these, or any other, locations would be feasible for hospital purposes.

U.S.S. "Pueblo": An Open Letter

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1968

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, two days after the U.S.S. *Pueblo* was seized by North Koreans I commented—not too facetiously—that we would gain return of the *Pueblo* even if we had to pay full price for it. Now there is doubt that even this will be attempted.

Few Americans believed that we would do nothing, but this has been our course and now many people wonder just what provocation is required to stimulate the present administration into standing up for the rights of all Americans.

We cannot forget the fate of the 83 men and ship, seized January 23, and people are not forgetting. Rather, they are angry. And they are frustrated with an abysmal lack of determination, or guts, or both. Few people have the ability or means for sharing their outrage but Clarence Pennington has and does.

As an officer of *Spensley Newspapers*, Mr. Pennington wrote and distributed an "open letter" through the Newark, Ohio, *Advocate*; the Fostoria, Ohio, *Review-Times*; and another paper in the greater Pittsburgh area. I would like to share it with you today. It is not a statement of the usual kind, with half-hearted opinions, couched in lukewarm admonitions.

But then, neither is the feeling of the average American.

The open letter follows:

I am an American—A citizen of the United States. I stand shame-faced, a tear in my eye and egg on my face.

I am frustrated by my leaders—Democrat and Republican, liberals and conservatives. They inherited a nation so long without fear that they didn't recognize it when it appeared on their own faces.

They tricked me with mock bravery into building history's greatest military might.

Spending. Spending. Spending. Billions and billions for defense. They told us the price was right; that all could stay free. Well, hell! What about the *Pueblo*! What about the eighty three Americans!

In Viet Nam they proved we still have the courage to fight, but they did not tell us when we lost our will to win.

The eighty three, now it is eighty two, know for sure that we have lost our will to fight, to be right; even the will for *them* to be free.

Did De Gaulle mark us as a whore among nations? Did he establish our price in dollars and in gold?

Is North Korea now trying to establish our price in men? If so, how many more than 83 is it. Is it 183? 8,300? 83,000?

Do you know something? I am an American and I don't even know. What's worse, may God help us, I don't even know whom to ask.

The source of my confusion is this: I was naive enough to believe we couldn't be had for 83 men. If we are proved to be such a whore among nations, that makes us a shade cheaper than the two-bit variety of yesterday.

I cry for the 83 of the *Pueblo* but I blush through my tears, for I am ashamed. I don't know where their ship was, but I do know it was American.

I would gladly risk all to free them but my leaders will not even permit me to sacrifice a small part of my comfort for fear they will lose their lofty seat of misused power.

This indictment is broader than the President and his cabinet, though I have heard the bleating weakness of their words and seen the fear on their faces.

So I must ask:

Admirals, do you sail a navy on a sea of fear? If the course is not of your design, why not resign and put us closer to the source of our weakness.

Generals, if you do not have the courage of your convictions, then step aside so we can deal with the men you fear. Don't shield their weakness and fear with your good name and military reputation.

Legislators, look at the pictures in your hallowed halls. All of you cannot be as great as they, but, my God, men, you should quit quaking and try. It's better to be an ex-legislator who tried and failed than a pimp who gets his money first.

And all you lesser lights who are covering up for these pompous asses. Why do you hold your silence and permit them to carry on this national disgrace in secret at Panmunjom or Washington or anywhere. History won't notice your shabby role but you still have to face yourself when you shave. Shame!

Can't you see their plan. They can be wiser than the people only so long as they keep us in the darkness of ignorance. If this secrecy is ordered under the guise of national security, what a price to pay for safety. The national disgrace is the same as the security guaranteed a prison inmate.

These men and all of us, should develop the will to win or at least have the courage to quit.

Since my leaders know the facts about the 83 and still display so much fear, I should be afraid or be a fool. Well, I choose to be

a fool; to pose a solution—born of ignorance, but, at least, a start.

We must tell North Koreans to have the *Pueblo* and the 83 at a given longitude and latitude in 10 days or the United States will take a certain punitive action. We should give them three or four such successive dates with increasingly tougher punitive actions, climaxing with rescue by force if they insist.

What punitive actions? In what severity? My ignorance denies me answers, but my leaders know. Let them do it, and let them do it now.

They must list these actions for the world when they list them for North Korea. Let them be actions which seek results.

For a change and out of fairness, let the rest of the world beat a path to Korea or China or Russia with their pleas to avoid World War III.

We have bent enough. We have been prostituted enough. We have been fooled, flattered and fouled too much.

Leaders! If you lack the will to win and the courage to quit, at least have the decency to admit it and the honesty to tell us—Why?

Crime Control

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1968

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, much of the Nation is deeply disturbed by the gripping problem of crime control. There seems a frightening uncertainty about what steps, if any, can be made effective. A panel of national figures has just produced a work in this field which offers no down-to-earth and readily usable solution. Perhaps the real problem is fear over coming to grips with crime and the criminal.

Two very significant illustrations of the practical effect of meeting crime head on with adequate local law enforcement and of the value of community cooperation and support are found in Miami and Orlando, Fla. I submit for reprinting in the *RECORD* accounts of the results of positive action in these cities. The reports were taken from *Gun Week* of March 8:

RAPE COUNT DOWN FROM 33 to 3

Orlando, Fla., where 6,000 women were trained in defense with a gun last year, has recorded a 90 per cent reduction in assaults upon women—and is one of the few cities in the nation to show an overall crime decrease in latest 1967 figures.

The program, which was conceived by the publisher of the *Orlando Sentinel and Star*, resulted from concern over the large numbers of firearms being purchased in the city by women frightened by a series of rapes.

Orlando Police Chief Carlisle Johnstone, approached by the publisher, agreed to hold a training class on a Sunday afternoon, but instructors were overwhelmed by 2,400 women who showed up carrying an assortment of firearms (*Gun Week*, Dec. 2, 1966).

Classes were quickly organized with the assistance of the newspaper and police, military and civilian instructors. They continued for an eight-month period.

As a result of national publicity, some of it derogatory, similar classes were organized in many other cities under the sponsorship of police, civic and professional groups and sportsmen's clubs.

Deputy Chief of Police Jack Stacey told

Gun Week that in the first 11 months of 1966 there were 27 forcible rapes and six attempted rapes in the city. During the same period in 1967, there was one forcible rape and two attempted rapes.

Stacey credited much of the decrease to the publicity given the program and added that he knew of no accidents involving members of the "posse", as the classes were termed, or their families.

He said the program had been beneficial for "it taught 6,000 women safe handling of guns" and resulted in "over 400 defective guns being examined and turned down as unsafe to fire" and the safe firing during training of more than 300,000 rounds.

Many of the guns brought to the classes were "cheap, inferior, not practical for defense and some very dangerous," he said.

Stacey said a large number of the 1966 rapes were perpetrated by one man, who was apprehended shortly after the program began, which he felt was one factor in the reduction.

Charlie Wadsworth, of the newspapers' staff, said that "We felt when trouble comes, people are going to obtain guns—and the fact that members of the posse were taught to use the guns, and would-be wrongers in our town knew this, would have a positive effect."

Wadsworth pointed out that during the first nine months of 1967 the national crime

rate increased 16 per cent while Orlando recorded a 2.9 decrease. It was one of the few cities in the nation to show such a decrease while the average increase of cities of its size was more than 19 per cent.

"I think this is due to the fact that people who commit these crimes were made fully aware that over 6,000 of our women knew how to handle a gun and to take care of themselves, and intended to do so if attacked," he added.

"When we closed the classes we were besieged with calls here at the office from people who had not enrolled and who wished to do so, and from people who didn't want the classes to stop. We still draw a query or two."

"As for my impression, and the effect of the program, I point to the reduction in crime percentage. That is about as effective as one program can get, I would think."

MIAMI CRIME RATE DROPS WITH NEW TOUGH POLICY

The Miami, Fla., Police Department in late February released figures showing a 62 per cent drop in robberies in three of the city's Negro districts since Police Chief Walter Headley's "get tough" policy started in late December (Gun Week, Jan. 26).

The figures show 71 robberies during the month of January in the three districts as compared to 188 in December.

Police statistics for January, the first full month for the new policy, show robberies throughout the city declined by 45 per cent from 299 in December to 163 in January.

These same figures showed that while 62 per cent of these robberies took place in the Negro districts in December, the same districts accounted for only 43 per cent of the total in January.

Chief Headley said he had received no complaints about the tougher policy from "any law-abiding citizen" in Miami. He said of the approximately 8,000 letters and telegrams from people all over the country only 23 opposed his stand.

"The NAACP was going to come down here and fight the thing, but they never showed up. The Civil Liberties Union was going to get an injunction against me, but nothing happened," Headley said.

Negro spokesmen say older residents of the districts and small merchants who were repeated victims of muggings and robberies, strongly favor the new policy.

Miami's "war on crime" began Dec. 28, when Headley said he would send patrols reinforced with police dogs and shotguns into Negro districts with orders to crack down on young Negroes who were "taking advantage of civil rights."

Chief Headley said the program would continue as long as it showed results.

SENATE—Friday, March 8, 1968

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF).

Rev. Edward B. Lewis, D.D., pastor, Capitol Hill Methodist Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Dear Heavenly Father, we are grateful for the fact that Your spirit is within each of us, willing to work through sensitive men and women seeking Your will. We affirm in this moment of prayer that we are enriched and blessed through the spirit of God within.

It is Your business, dear Lord, to forgive, guide, strengthen, heal, and renew a sick and confused generation of the children of men. We pray for this kind of ministry from on high as we meet in this high place of government. May the reality of Thy holy spirit work in and through worthy national and international leaders. We are deeply concerned. Our hope in a day of disorder is to find divine order.

Give these men and women clear minds and romantic faith with a will not to be distressed or defeated by the tragic scene now being played on the world's stage. Help us to believe with unwavering faith that every condition can be healed, that with God nothing is impossible. Forgive us. Enlighten us. Lead us to truth and right. We pray in the Master's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 7, 1968, be dispensed with.

CXIV—366—Part 5

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

INTERFERENCE WITH CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the unfinished business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title.

The BILL CLERK. A bill (H.R. 2516) to prescribe penalties for certain acts of violence or intimidation, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and it will be a live quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll, and the

following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 39 Leg.]

Aiken	Hart	Pell
Bayh	Inouye	Sparkman
Byrd, W. Va.	Javits	Stennis
Ellender	Kennedy, N.Y.	Tydings
Ervin	Mansfield	Williams, Del.
Gore	Metcalf	

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS] is absent because of an illness in his family.

I also announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] are necessarily absent.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is absent by leave of the Senate because of death in his family.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] are detained on official business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is not present.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the presence of absent Senators.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tem-